

resort. Let me read the provisions of the amendment. I take the first paragraph of section 203, with a change only of the concluding phrase, the meaning of which, as I have already pointed out, is rather vague:

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized by any Government agency having control over manpower, production, or materials, on a restricted basis, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

(b) There is hereby created in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a Board of Appeals to consist of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each of whom shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of 2 years. When any person is aggrieved by the action of any such Government agency referred to in subsection (a) in allocating available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, such person shall, upon application therefor under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, be afforded an opportunity forthwith to present his views thereon at a hearing before the Board of Appeals. If at such hearing such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Board of Appeals that as a result of such action his business operations will be seriously interfered with or substantially curtailed because of a shortage of any material necessary to such operations, that his inability to continue business operations will result in a serious unemployment problem for his employees, or that the interests of the consumers of the articles produced or manufactured by such person will be substantially impaired, the Board of Appeals shall make an immediate report thereon to the Director. Thereupon the Director shall allocate to such person such amounts of the material with respect to which the shortage exists as in his judgment will be necessary to prevent substantial hardship to such person, his employees, or consumers.

That, Mr. President, is the substance of the amendment which I trust will receive the sympathetic consideration of the Senators from Montana, West Virginia, and Georgia.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, that I have a very high respect for his judgment and knowledge in this field. After listening to his very brilliant argument I am prepared to say that I am willing to accept his proposed amendment, and make it a part of the modifications which I have presented this afternoon, in order that the Senate may have an opportunity to vote upon it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment may be further modified accordingly.

DIRECTOR OF WOMEN'S BUREAU—NOMINATION OF FRIEDA S. MILLER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination upon the executive calendar. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frieda S. Miller to be Director of the Women's Bureau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have consulted with Senators on both sides of the Chamber, and in view of the desire to facilitate the disposal of the pending legislative proposal as much as possible, and in order that it may be on its way and the Senate reach a vote on the controversial items contained in the bill, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, August 10, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 9 (legislative day of August 8), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Frieda S. Miller to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 8, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who art infinite in mercy, in love, and in power, we rejoice in the revelation that although Thou art high and holy, yet hast Thou respect unto the lowly.

May we now, in all humility, yield ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the leading of Thy spirit in order that we may be brought into obedience with Thy will and receive the blessing of Thy peace.

We pray that Thy benediction may rest upon the Members of the Senate, and especially upon the various committees who are now challenged with difficult tasks and decisions. God grant that when we are confronted with problems that seem to defy solution we may not rely upon our own wisdom or human ingenuity or turn our eyes upon the ground, whence can come no help, but may we lift them in faith unto Thee, for Thou art willing and able to do for us exceed-

ingly abundantly, above all that we can ask or think.

Hear us for the sake of needy humanity and the cause of righteousness and, above all, for Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, August 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TRUMAN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, held this morning, a resolution was adopted which I was instructed to read to the Senate. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN, United States Senator, has submitted his resignation as chairman of this committee, and the members of this committee with the greatest reluctance have accepted his resignation: Therefore it is hereby

Resolved, That the committee insert into its permanent records this unanimous expression of its sentiment:

Under the leadership of Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN, the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, which appropriately became known as the Truman committee, has established a record which speaks for itself.

The Senator from Missouri conceived this committee. He submitted the resolution under which it was first authorized. His work has been characterized by modesty, tact, and diplomacy, and by his infinite capacity for preserving harmony within the committee. He has led but never driven. He has been wise, kindly, firm, and courageous. His devotion to duty, his tireless efforts to find all the facts and let the facts speak for themselves, his good judgment, his patriotic love of his country, all are reflected in the Nation's confidence in this committee as guardian over the vast sums of public funds appropriated by the Congress for the winning of this war.

The accomplishments of the committee reflect these characteristics of its great chairman, and its members say to their colleague from Missouri, Col. HARRY S. TRUMAN, Field Artillery, Officers' Reserve Corps, "Well done, soldier."

A TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. LESLEY J. MCNAIR

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, one of the many tragic events which have occurred in this war was the death of Gen. Lesley J. McNair in France, unfortunately caused by a missile from some of our own troops, a bomb dropped a little too far behind our lines.

General McNair had a very distinguished military record. For a considerable period of time he was in charge of all the ground forces, which included, of course, the Infantry, the last wave, which cleans up the enemy, and I think he was largely responsible for the success of our troops, raw troops, in France.

I have been amazed and astounded as I have read how these troops, who had never previously been in action, were able to march in and drive out seasoned German soldiers, throwing back the armies of Hitler in France. I doubt not that one of the main factors in that

situation was the thorough training those soldiers received over a period of a year and a half or 2 years.

General McNair was perhaps the outstanding officer in that program of training, and as a tribute to him I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a short memorandum respecting the general and his background, his history, and his service in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tragic death of Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair on the Normandy front, like the accidental death of another great American general, Stonewall Jackson, at the hands of his own men, brings to light a character strong and unique in the history of the American Army. Able and courageous, he faced and conquered the task of converting the untrained manpower of this country into fighting forces capable of successfully engaging the skilled land armies of the Axis nations on the field of battle. And when that mission was largely accomplished, he sought and received an important assignment overseas, where he met his untimely death. As General Marshall said "Had he had the choice, he probably would have elected to die as he did, in the forefront of the attack."

General McNair was born in Verndale, Minn., on May 25, 1883. He was appointed to the United States Military Academy on August 1, 1900, and upon his graduation on June 15, 1904, was commissioned a second lieutenant of artillery.

General McNair was promoted to grade of first lieutenant on July 1, 1905; to captain on May 29, 1907; to major on May 15, 1917; to lieutenant colonel (temporary) on August 5, 1917; to colonel (temporary) on June 26, 1918; and to brigadier general (temporary) on October 1, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of major on July 15, 1919; and was promoted to lieutenant colonel on January 9, 1928; to colonel on May 1, 1935; to brigadier general on January 1, 1937; to major general (temporary) on September 25, 1940; to major general (permanent) on December 1, 1940; and to lieutenant general (temporary) on June 9, 1941.

He first served with the Field Artillery at Fort Douglas, Utah, from September 15, 1904, until June 1, 1905, when he was transferred to the Ordnance Department, and assigned to duty at Sandy Hook Proving Ground, N. J., where he served until July 1, 1906. He then served in the Office of the Chief of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., until September 12, 1906; and at Watertown Arsenal, Mass., to June 14, 1908, when he was relieved from duty in the Ordnance Department. He was assigned to the Fourth Field Artillery on July 1, 1909, and served with his regiment at Fort D. A. Russell (now Fort Francis E. Warren), Wyo., until January 14, 1913, during which time he served for short periods at San Antonio, Tex., and at Fort Sill, Okla. He was ordered to France to witness practice of French Artillery in January 1913, and remained there until August 25, 1913.

When General McNair returned to the United States he was assigned to duty at Fort Sill, Okla., where he served until April 25, 1914. He was with the Funston Expedition to Vera Cruz until September 11, 1914, when he returned to Fort Sill, where he remained until May 11, 1916. He went into Mexico with the Punitive Expedition, where he served until February 1917. Upon his return to the United States he was stationed at El Paso and Leon Springs, Tex., until June 5, 1917.

General McNair sailed for France in June 1917, with the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces on August 21, 1917, was assigned to G. H. Q., American Expeditionary Forces, Paris and Chaumont, until May 15, 1919, and thereafter with the First Division in Germany until June 23, 1919. Upon his return to the United States he was an instructor at the General Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., until January 23, 1921, during which period he was graduated from the School of the Line.

He was ordered to Hawaii in February 1921, where he served with the Operations and Training Division, General Staff, Hawaiian Department, until February 11, 1924. Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to duty as professor of military science and tactics at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., where he served until June 1, 1923. He then attended the Army War College and, upon his graduation in 1929, was assigned to duty as assistant commandant, Field Artillery School, until June 24, 1933. Thereafter, he served with the Sixteenth Field Artillery, at Fort Bragg, N. C., until September 1, 1934; and then on C. C. C. duty at Camp Beauregard, La., to March 31, 1935. He then returned to Washington in April 1935 as executive officer in the office, Chief of Field Artillery. On March 7, 1937, he assumed command of the Second Field Artillery Brigade at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and on April 6, 1939, became commandant of the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. In July 1940 he was assigned as Chief of Staff of the General Headquarters, United States Army, with offices at the Army War College, Washington, D. C. On March 9, 1942, he was named Commanding General of the Army Ground Forces.

General McNair was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Medal of the French Legion of Honor (officer) for his services in France during World War No. 1. He received the Purple Heart from Lt. Gen. George S. Patton for the wounds he received on the north African battle front in 1943.

Gen. George C. Marshall's appraisal of his good friend and right-hand man, Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, as "the brains of the Army . . ." was indicative of the high regard in which he was held by Army personnel in general. And General Marshall was by no means alone in his judgment of that quiet, forceful officer who had been largely responsible for turning out a modern army to do a modern war job.

"Briefly, the mission of the Army Ground Forces is to create units and train them so that they are fit to fight," explained this sandy-haired general with the terse simplicity that was his outstanding characteristic. "The units then are turned over for employment in theaters of operations."

In keeping with his citation for the Distinguished Service Medal, awarded in 1918, which reads, " . . . he displayed marked ability in correctly estimating the changing conditions and requirements of military tactics." General McNair refused to be hide-bound by nineteenth century concepts of fighting. Methods of war change; and General McNair was determined that the United States soldiers should learn the new fighting techniques and better them.

"The World War was a static one," he once pointed out. "It was more a matter of crushing by sheer mass. Equipment was comparatively simple. Today a division must be more versatile, more artful. It must be smarter, swifter, more flexible, and adaptable, in order to meet the endless array of situations which must be faced. The airplane and the tank loom large in the picture and make life complex and uncertain."

According to his own description, General McNair was a "pick-and-shovel man." He was interested only in getting things done, and with the least possible publicity. One of his aides characterized him this way: "You can always tell what the general's answer to a request will be by asking yourself, 'Will it help the war effort?'"

With little patience for the formalities of administration, General McNair scribbled his answers to many a letter at the bottom of the page. Wordiness annoyed him, and oratorical eloquence was not in his sphere. No one has yet succeeded in writing a speech that he delivered. The files are full of moving orations, written for him, that he had discarded in favor of his own simple addresses, often batted out on his home typewriter mounted on a packing case in the study of his Army War College quarters.

Slight of stature, the general had the decided, yet undramatic bearing of a soldier. Neither pomp nor ceremony were in his vocabulary, and when he wanted to speak to a member of his staff, he would often step down the hall to the subordinate's office and ask him to come in. A real traveling man—General McNair liked to take a personal look at units in training—he has shocked many an officer by stepping from his plane informally, blouseless, and ready for work, much in the tradition of his classmate, Lt. Gen. Joseph Stilwell.

No longer theoretical is the estimate of the kind of job General McNair has performed. The success of American ground forces all over the world, made up of trained men doing the work they have to do with initiative and efficiency, is a magnificent tribute to the effectiveness of his work. He died as he lived, without fanfare or flourish, where, soldier to the last, his final moments were spent among those whom he had taught to fight. Of him, it may well be said, "Not for fame or reward, not for place or for rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty, as he understood it, he dared all—suffered all—sacrificed all—and died."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, vice the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], resigned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the various units of his Department for the quarter ending September 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXPENDITURES IN SEVERAL AGENCIES FOR TRAVEL, PRINTING, BINDING, AND MOTOR-PROPELLED PASSENGER-CARRYING VEHICLES

A letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters addressed to the heads of the Foreign Economic Administration, National War Labor Board, Office of Censorship, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Price Administration, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and the War Production Board, relating to the amounts which may be expended for travel, printing, and binding, and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles from

sums set apart in appropriations for special projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

TREATMENT OF WAR PRISONERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point resolutions which I have received from Henry P. Lynch, commander, Winchester Ex-Servicemen's Association of New Haven, Conn. The resolutions protest "the treatment of prisoners of war held in the United States."

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINCHESTER EX-SERVICEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

New Haven, Conn., August 9, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: At a regular meeting of the Winchester Ex-Servicemen's Association, held July 31, 1944, at the association's headquarters, it was resolved:

"That the Winchester Ex-Servicemen's Association go on record as protesting the treatment of prisoners of war; particularly, and more especially for this record those prisoners of war being held in the United States.

"Through reports from servicemen, press and radio commentators, it is understood that prisoners of war are being coddled and pampered; in fact, are being treated with extreme leniency. Such treatment of these prisoners of war has caused the deepest concern to servicemen, ex-servicemen and families of servicemen who have lost their lives during this present conflict, possibly at the hands of these same prisoners.

"This treatment of war prisoners is affecting the morale of all American citizens and is raising false hopes in the hearts of those who may have loved ones held prisoners by our enemies."

It was further resolved:

"That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy and United States Senators and Congressmen from Connecticut, with the earnest request that corrective action be taken immediately."

Respectfully,

HENRY P. LYNCH,
Commander.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN UNITARIAN YOUTH CONVENTION

Mr. BURTON presented resolutions adopted by the American Unitarian Youth Convention held at Ferry Beach, Maine, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN YOUTH CONVENTION HELD AT FERRY BEACH, MAINE, JULY 6-8, 1944

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Be it

Resolved, That the American Unitarian Youth send the following two resolutions to the President of the United States of America, the United States State Department, and to Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate:

"A. Be it

Resolved, That the American Unitarian Youth recognizes that winning the war is of paramount importance. We urge the home

front to continue top production, to recognize and resist Fascist propaganda, and to insure complete military victory which will enable us to make a satisfactory peace.

"B. Be it

Resolved, That the American Unitarian Youth favors a world organization which will have power through economic sanctions and a world police force to regulate trade, to prevent conflict between countries, to help countries to settle by democratic processes internal conflicts which affect world peace, and to be responsible for promoting better standards of living by measures to improve economic conditions and educational and health facilities. Private monopolies and cartels should be restricted and controlled by the world government for the benefit of all people rather than a few. We recommend complete disarmament of all nations. Membership in the world organization should be open to all nations and careful attention should be given to measures to insure equal representation of all peoples of the world. All decisions should be made by majority vote."

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as strongly in favor of a permanent F. E. P. C. We urge our members to work for legislation establishing and strengthening such a body.

ANTI-POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Be it

Resolved, That this convention is strongly opposed to the undemocratic poll tax and favors Federal legislation to abolish it. We urge local groups to contact and cooperate with existing anti-poll-tax organizations and to bring pressure to bear on their congressional representatives to pass the anti-poll-tax bill if necessary by invoking cloture.

SOLDIER VOTE LEGISLATION

Be it here stated that this convention regrets the actions of Congress which have made it very difficult and practically impossible for our soldier citizens to vote.

Be it further recommended that our members exert every effort to assist men and women in the service in getting all the information needed so that they may vote under existing conditions.

Be it finally recommended that local groups send such information to church members, relatives, and friends in the service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Col. William A. Eddy, of New Hampshire, United States Marine Corps, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

Earl T. Crain, of Illinois, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

J. William Henry, of Arizona, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service; and

Sundry persons for promotion in the Foreign Service, to be effective as of July 16, 1944.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. TAFT):

S. 2065. A bill to establish a Surplus War Property Administration; to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. KILGORE (for Mr. McCARRAN) introduced Senate bill 2066, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2067. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; and

S. 2068. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps, approved December 26, 1941, so as to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts of disbursing officers and special disbursing agents of the Navy and Coast Guard"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which is investigating the liquor industry, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, which, if passed, will effectuate the recommendations of the subcommittee. The Senator from Nevada asks that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, apparently the bill affects the revenues and the Internal Revenue Bureau. I think the Committee on Finance has jurisdiction of such legislation, rather than the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think the bill deals with the question of revenue. The bill proposes an amendment to the Revenue Act, but is not directly concerned with the question of revenue. The Senator from Nevada has asked that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and I present his request.

Mr. BARKLEY. All legislation dealing with revenues has been handled by the Committee on Finance. I do not know whether the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has had his attention called to the bill, but I think, until it has been looked into, reference of the measure should be withheld.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to examine the bill at the earliest opportunity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reference of the bill will be withheld temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair) subsequently said: The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], this morning introduced a bill and asked that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair that it should be referred to the Committee on Finance, and it is referred to that committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2066) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for Mr. McCARRAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. ROBERTSON each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 319), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to on March 1, 1941, and subsequent resolutions, relating to the investigation of the national defense program, hereby is increased by \$100,000.

A LIVING MEMORIAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Living Memorial," delivered by him at Whitefish Bay, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. EUGENE REYBOLD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, New Orleans, La., on July 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY PAUL L. STYLES AND EDITORIAL COMMENT BY THE ATLANTA JOURNAL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on industrial peace, delivered by Paul L. Styles, vice chairman of the fourth regional war labor board, before a meeting of personnel directors and labor officials at Brunswick, Ga., on August 2, 1944, together with an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of August 2, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

CREATING PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM NEWS-AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Creating Peace," published in the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of July 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECONVERSION OF INDUSTRY—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Bill To Make Unemployment Blissful," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of August 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE HATCH ACT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article and editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 9, 1944, relating to a favorable ruling on the constitutionality of the so-called Hatch Act, which appear in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS WITH POLAND—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Great Doublecross," by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the first Murray-Kilgore amendment, so-called, as modified, striking out all after section 101 of said amendment and inserting in lieu thereof certain language.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Revercomb
Andrews	Gurney	Reynolds
Austin	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Duck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Green	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is recuperating from a major operation at the Mayo Clinic, and that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Mr. Maurice F. Devine, chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, with reference to the legislative proposal now pending in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be read by the clerk at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 9, 1944.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
• United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

With respect to proposals reference war mobilization and post-war adjustment now before Senate known either as Murray-Kilgore bill, George bill, or the amendments, the American Legion disapproves (1) any proposal to place veterans administration under direction or control of any other governmental agency on matters as to which it presently has jurisdiction over veterans problems or the preparation and administration of regulations, instructions, or procedure relating to veterans such as in sections 102, 301 and 302 of the Murray-Kilgore bill or amendment and sections 102, 301, and 302 of the George amendment; (2) to classifying civilian workers with war veterans in the matter of retraining and reemployment such as in title III of the Murray-Kilgore bill and amendment and title III of the George amendment; (3) to granting education, retraining or unemployment benefits to civilian war workers, not otherwise covered, on the same basis or in excess of similar provisions for war veterans as provided by Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), such as in sections 307 and 309 of Murray-Kilgore bill or amendment; (4) to establishment of Retraining and Reemployment Administration which in any manner will usurp or encroach upon duties and responsibilities of Veterans' Administration under Servicemen's Readjustment Act 1944, such as in sections 301 and 302 of the Kilgore-Murray bill or amendment and sections 102, 301, and 302 of George amendment; (5) to extending education, retraining, or unemployment benefits to persons who are not citizens of the United States and have not shown disposition to become such as is done in sections 307 and 501 (j) of Kilgore-Murray bill or amendment; (6) to any proposal which centralizes at Federal level rather than State level the administration of any social security benefits or unemployment compensation such as in sections 102, 309, and 312 and related sections of Kilgore-Murray bill and amendment; (7) to attempt to federalize the operation of the national system of public employment offices such as in section 306 (b) of the Kilgore-Murray bill and amendment; (8) to the conflict, duplication, confusion, and uncertainty created by section 307 Murray-Kilgore amendment which covers the same subject matter in whole or in part of Public Laws 16, 113, and title II of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; (9) both Kilgore-Murray bill and amendment and George amendment will destroy several months' work and nullify progress which has been made in acquisition of experienced, qualified personnel and perfecting administrative organization and plans to effectuate titles II, IV, and V of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress and will postpone and set back effective operation of that act for whose benefits hundreds of war veterans are daily clamoring, and will further retard and postpone preparation necessary to

meet post-war adjustment problems of both war veterans and the Nation. These objections do not imply approval or disapproval of other provisions contained in this legislation not referred to.

MAURICE F. DEVINE,
Chairman, National Legislative
Committee, the American Legion.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. With reference to the telegram from the chairman of the legislative committee of the American Legion, which has just been read at the desk, I beg to make an observation at this time. The Murray-Kilgore bill would actually repeal title V of the G. I. soldiers' bill of rights. The amendments in the George amendment, to which reference is made, were lifted directly out of the Murray-Kilgore bill with perhaps no changes. But the amendment offered by me is not intended—and that will be made abundantly clear—to interfere with, to deprive the Veterans' Administration of jurisdiction, or to split the jurisdiction of the administration of the veterans' bill already passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will further permit me, I should like to send to the desk and have read at this time two telegrams, one from the far-away State of Montana endorsing the George bill, and the second from a State in the Southeast, the progressive State of North Carolina, with reference to the Murray-Kilgore bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the telegrams, as follows:

HELENA, MONT., August 10, 1944.
Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have read with care S. 2051 which you have introduced and wish to briefly express appreciation of this Montana agency. If your bill passes we think social-security program will be greatly strengthened and there will be some local participation so necessary to successful administration where a program comes in touch with millions of affected individuals. We think this bill would greatly strengthen unemployment compensation and encourage States to liberalize their laws in a common-sense manner. We feel confident this will occur in Montana if Congress favors your measure. With best wishes,

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
COMMISSION OF MONTANA,
BARCLAY CRAIGHEAD, Chairman.

RALEIGH, N. C., August 9, 1944.
Hon. WALTER GEORGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing the prevailing sentiment in North Carolina, I have today wired to each of our Senators as follows: "The sentiment in North Carolina is overwhelmingly against any federalization of unemployment compensation, and it is the feeling here that the bill proposed by Senator GEORGE in respect to protecting State controls represents the soundest position. I earnestly hope that you will find it possible to oppose any measure which involves higher turning over to the Federal Government the control of this important function, which has thus far been admirably administered by the States, or giving to the Federal Government the control of the State agencies dealing with this fund.

Any revisions or supplements that may be needed in connection with this service can be adequately handled through existing State agencies."

J. M. BROUGHTON,
Governor of North Carolina.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with reference to the telegram from the American Legion, nearly all the criticism is directed to the provisions of the Kilgore bill, except in one respect. So far as I can see, the George bill would in no way change in any respect the rights of any veteran, nor does it propose anything which would transfer any powers from the Veterans' Administration. The only thing which is apparently criticized is the provision of section 302, which places the Work Administrator, who would have general charge of what we may call the problem of human demobilization, in an over-all position so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned.

In other words, I take it that the objection of the American Legion, so far as the George bill is concerned, is confined to the creation of this office, which in a way would be superior to the Veterans' Administration. That question might also arise as to the office which the President has already created, except that the President has seen fit to appoint as retraining and reemployment administrator General Hines, who is also the head of the Veterans' Administration. So no conflict has developed under the executive agency. I assume that the objection of the American Legion is that the two offices might be held by different persons, and that someone might be able to boss the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I believe that question should be considered. As I see it, that is the only objection in this telegram to the provisions of the George bill.

Mr. President, the question of post-war conversion was first dealt with by the Baruch committee report. That report was made on February 15, 1944. It received very general commendation from all the newspapers in the United States. It was generally accepted as a program for post-war conversion. So far as I can see, the Kilgore bill has practically neglected the Baruch report and thrown it to one side. It proposes an entirely different program. Why the Baruch report was not sooner written into legislation I do not know. At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary index of recommendations A, B, and C of the Baruch report because I think that report shows the basis for our whole reconversion legislation, particularly as embodied in the George bill.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART III. SUMMARY INDEX OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. HUMAN SIDE OF DEMOBILIZATION

1. That the Government forces dealing with the human problems of demobilization be unified on two fronts—the executive and Congress.

2. On the executive side, creation in the Office of War Mobilization of the new post of Work Director to "see that the human side of demobilization is not forgotten."

3. This Work Director to be a man of such outstanding caliber as "to command the immediate confidence of the country."

4. This Work Director to work with Congress in the development of a combined program of legislation and operations "to carry out the objectives that all of us share."

5. Among the fields to be covered by this Work Director—personnel demobilization of the armed forces, developing adequate machinery for job placement of veterans and demobilized war workers, adequate care for returning veterans, physical and occupational therapy for wounded and disabled, resumption of education interrupted by war, vocational training, the special employment problems of the great war industries, and others.

6. That there be in each community only one place to which returning servicemen and servicewomen need to go to learn all their rights and how to get them.

B. SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

1. To assure quick cash pending settlement, a complete financial kit is assembled, including:

(a) Immediate payment—the full 100 percent—for all completed articles.

(b) On the uncompleted portion of the contract, immediate payment—the full 100 percent—of the Government's estimate of factual items, where proof ordinarily is simple, such as direct labor or materials, and of other items on which the Government is able to satisfy itself, up to 90 percent of the contractor's total estimated costs.

(c) Immediate payment—the full 100 percent—of settlements with subcontractors as soon as approved.

(d) Payment by the Government of interest on termination claims until settled.

(e) As insurance against delays in validating claims, a new simplified system of T (termination) loans by local banks, with Government guaranties, to be available to all war contractors, primes and subs.

(f) For those unable to obtain such loans from their local banks in 30 days, the Government to make the loans directly.

(g) Until the new T loans are authorized by Congress, extension of V and VT loans to all eligible borrowers.

(h) Finally, for hardship cases, unable to use any of the tools outlined above, expedited settlements.

2. Quick, fair, and final settlement through negotiation by contractors and procurement agencies.

3. As a more effective safeguard of the public interest than the kind of review suggested by the Comptroller General:

(a) Review powers of Comptroller General limited to fraud with every administrative aid for detecting fraud.

(b) That all sizable settlements be made by teams of negotiators.

(c) These teams to file written reports and keep full records of the bases of settlement.

(d) Contractors to keep records for 3 years.

(e) That the Comptroller General and the Attorney General be added to the Joint Contract Termination Board.

(f) Further administrative safeguards now under study.

4. Establishment on an operating basis of a Joint Contract Termination Board within the Office of War Mobilization, to unify procedures and policies of all agencies:

(a) The Board chairman to be a civilian, independent of any of the procurement agencies, answerable to the Director of War Mobilization.

(b) This chairman to require progress reports from all agencies and to report regularly to Congress.

(c) Also to maintain a running survey of the extent to which V and VT loans and the new T loans are taken out.

(d) To keep a constant eye on all aspects of contract settlement recommending any changes that become necessary.

(e) The War Production Board be added to the Joint Contract Board.

5. Spread acceptance by war contractors of the Uniform Termination Article for fixed-price contracts.

6. Speed the handling of subcontractor claims:

(a) The procurement agencies to be authorized by legislation to protect subcontractors in event of insolvency or default of their customers.

(b) A standard termination article for subcontractors to be completed soon to supplement the uniform termination article for prime contractors.

(c) A minimum figure to be set by the Director of War Mobilization below which nuisance-sized claims can be immediately validated with suitable safeguards.

(d) Vigorous experiment with the so-called company-sized type of settlement, seeking a workable plan.

7. Schools to be set up around the country for training Government negotiators and contractor representatives in the same classrooms.

8. Prompt clearance of Government property from private plants not later than 60 days after the filing of inventory lists, the manufacturers having the right to remove and store the property earlier at their own risks.

9. This entire termination program to be put into effect by the agencies at once to the extent administratively possible.

10. Prompt enactment of legislation to make this program fully effective, including appropriate authority to permit company-wide settlements, to the extent found practicable.

C. SURPLUS PROPERTY

1. The Director of War Mobilization to name a Surplus Property Administrator in the Office of War Mobilization with full authority for handling every aspect of surplus disposal.

2. A Surplus Property Policy Board, the Administrator as chairman with full and final authority, and with these agencies represented: War, Navy, Treasury, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Maritime Commission, War Production Board, Bureau of the Budget, the Food Administrator, the Attorney General, Federal Works Agency, State Department, and Foreign Economic Administration.

3. Four major outlets to handle actual disposal, each in a clearly defined field, with no overlappings:

(a) Consumer goods to the Treasury Procurement Division.

(b) Capital and producer goods, all types of industrial property, to a single corporation within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, consolidating present R. F. C. subsidiaries.

(c) Ships and maritime property to the Maritime Commission.

(d) Food to the Food Administrator.

4. All of these agencies, as well as any other agencies called upon to handle special disposal problems, to follow policies laid down by the Administrator in consultation with the Policy Board.

5. The Surplus Administrator to report to Congress as soon as possible on legislation needed, basing his recommendations on actual experience with the problem.

6. Our own suggestions as to the broad policies that the Surplus Administrator may wish to follow are summed up in 10 basic principles:

"1. Sell as much as he can as early as he can without unduly disrupting normal trade.

"2. Listen to pressure groups, but act in the national interest.

"3. No sales, no rentals to speculators; none to promoters.

"4. Get fair market prices for the values with proceeds of all sales going to reduce the national debt.

"5. Sell as in a goldfish bowl, with records always open to public inspection.

"6. As far as practicable, use the same regular channels of trade that private business would in disposing of the particular properties.

"7. No Government operation of surplus war plants in competition with private industry.

"8. No monopoly; equal access to surpluses for all businesses; preference to local ownership, but no subsidizing of one part of the country against another.

"9. Scrap what must be scrapped, but no deliberate destruction of useful property.

"10. Before selling surplus equipment abroad, assure America's own productive efficiency on which our high wages and high living standards rest."

7. The Surplus Administrator to be a man of proven executive capacity, business sagacity, unquestioned integrity, and great courage to fight off the selfish interests who will be seeking to exploit these surpluses.

8. The facts on all sales to be open to public inspection, with regular reports from each disposal agency to Congress.

9. All of the disposal agencies to make effective use of industry advisory committees.

10. The disposal agencies to lease as well as sell, to exchange properties, to sell on credit—but leasing must not become a hidden device for Government ownership or subsidies.

11. The Army and the Navy to examine their inventories of the most critical civilian items to see what can be safely released during the war for the civilian economy without hurting the war.

12. Surplus Administrator to study how to centralize the handling of real property, also, to explore the possibilities of beginning to liquidate Government holdings.

13. The closest cooperation between the War Production Board and the Surplus Administrator so that controls do not necessarily hinder disposition by unduly limiting potential buyers, particularly in assuring prompt disposal of small quantities of surplus materials.

14. The Surplus Administrator and the disposal agencies to have available to them in carrying out their policies the entire field force of all of the various agencies, including the services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the summary includes three parts. The first is the human side of demobilization, under recommendation A. That part relates to the Work Director.

Recommendation B relates to the settlement of terminated war contracts. That subject was dealt with in a bill which Congress has already passed.

Recommendation C deals with surplus property. That subject is dealt with in a bill introduced today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I hope that bill may be reported in some form by the Military Affairs Subcommittee before Monday of next week.

Those are the three things which the Baruch report recommended, and those are the things which we are now considering. As I have said, we have already disposed of the question of a Director of Contract Termination. The bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee today would set up a Director of Surplus Property for surplus property disposition. The current discussion of the pending bill should therefore deal with the third subject, that of the human side of demobilization, as covered by the Baruch report. The powers proposed to be given the Work Director in the Baruch report are nothing like those proposed in the Kilgore bill.

The second function of this bill is to set up an over-all agency, headed by a Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. It is proposed to continue the Office of War Mobilization, which is an over-all agency for war purposes, as an over-all peace agency over the other three agencies. Therefore, the questions which we have before us deal, first, with the general over-all agency, laying down certain principles of legislation, and, second, creating a Work Director to have some general supervision over the problem of the human side of demobilization.

I wish to discuss the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

In the first place, the first paragraph, title I, section 101, would set up an over-all Director. The powers proposed to be given are rather comprehensive. The George amendment is substantially the same, except that it makes somewhat more clear the fact that no additional powers are intended to be conferred. The language of the George amendment is as follows:

Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under existing law or future acts of the Congress.

So it is intended merely to give the over-all Director power to coordinate the programs of other agencies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator say that that was a provision of the George amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I said that was a provision of the George amendment. There is a somewhat similar provision in the Murray-Kilgore bill, although it is not quite satisfactory. That provision is:

Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities to carry out any plan formulated under this section which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the Government agencies under the Constitution or under provisions of law other than this section.

I do not know just what powers the President has under the Constitution once the war is over, to carry out any plans. I do not like to imply that he has any powers that are not derived from Congress. I do not know what they are.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand the Senator to say that the two bills are essentially in agreement in not conferring additional authority.

Mr. TAFT. As to the creation of the Director; but the Murray-Kilgore bill further provides that he shall—

evaluate and report on current and projected public and private activities affecting war mobilization and peacetime full production and employment; survey continuously the necessity for such additional programs of legislation as will achieve the objects of this act; promote and assist in the development of war mobilization and post-war adjustment plans and surveys by other Government agencies; such surveys shall include (without being limited thereto) programs and measures for public works, housing, taxation,

industrial and regional development, expansion of foreign trade, social security, and the maintenance of competitive enterprise.

In other words, that would give him full power, as I see it, to set up a new National Resources Planning Board, such as the one which was abolished by Congress last year. In fact, I have no doubt that if that provision were enacted into law, the same individuals who were operating the National Resources Planning Board, most of whom are now scattered among other agencies, would be again placed on a National Resources Planning Board.

The bill also provides for an assistant director, who is not provided for in the George bill. He is called a deputy director. He would receive a salary of \$10,000 a year.

It shall be the function of the Deputy Director and the Division of Programs and Projects to assist the Director in discharging his responsibilities under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) In addition to any authority which the President may delegate to him, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President and with the assistance of the Deputy Director—

And so forth. In other words, as I see it, we would have a sort of Knudsen-Hillman concept again. It is proposed to set up a board with two individuals at the top, the second of whom must always be consulted. I do not know whether this bill was in any way inspired by Mr. Hillman, but I cannot help thinking that the position which is proposed to be created is one which is designed for a man with the labor views of Mr. Hillman.

The bill proceeds and confers rather broader powers than are given in the George bill. The Director is given power to administer a Government agency to rescind, modify, or amend any regulation or order.

Then there is created something called a National Production-Employment Board, consisting of three representatives of industry, three representatives of labor, three representatives of agriculture, and one public member who shall be the chairman—a kind of special-interest bill.

Mr. WILEY. In which bill is that provided for?

Mr. TAFT. In the Kilgore bill. In the George bill provision is made for the creation of a committee consisting of three members of the same kind; but the committee provided for in the George bill is merely advisory to the Administrator. Apparently the Kilgore bill considers that the Board shall have certain powers of its own, for it provides—

(b) It shall be the general function of the Board to review the programs and activities of the Director and other Government agencies with respect to war mobilization and post-war adjustment and make to the President, the Congress, and the Director such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary to achieve the objectives of this act.

In other words, the Board will review everything the Director does, and will rush to the President whenever the Director does anything they think is not suitable or is not in accord with what they think should be done.

In addition to that, on page 8, in subsection (e), it is provided that—

The Director, with the advice and consent of the Board, shall—

(1) establish industry advisory councils for the various industries, and area advisory councils for various geographic areas, which are substantially and directly affected by the policies, programs, and operations of Government agencies performing functions subject to the jurisdiction of the Office.

In other words, these industry committees are to be something like the former N. R. A. committees. They are going to decide how much production should be allowed. The whole thing contemplates, as I see it, a full control of production for some 2 or 3 years after the war, and these committees are to be the means of carrying it out, particularly industry committees made up of industrial members and labor members or made up of all labor members, so far as the bill provides, for the provision is that the Director may appoint anyone he wishes to serve on these industry and area advisory committees. It is recognized that this may threaten a kind of monopoly control in violation of the anti-trust laws, because down at the bottom of the page it is provided—

That full information on all such councils shall be submitted to the Attorney General and no such councils shall continue any operations or activities which the Attorney General finds and certifies to the Director tend to promote the restraint of trade or the extension of monopoly.

It is pointed out by Mr. Arthur Krock that if the Attorney General approves of an N. R. A., he can merely withhold any opinion, and then the committees can go ahead with any plans they choose to formulate, or any industry codes.

It seems to me that the whole tone of the Kilgore bill in title I indicates a completely integrated control of industry, labor, and everyone else for a period of 3 years after the war, whereas all that the Baruch report recommends and all that the George bill does is to create an over-all Director who shall have general power to coordinate the plans of the various agencies of the Government under the powers which have been conferred upon the Government.

There is quite a strong provision in section 201 (b).

Mr. DAVIS. On what page is that to be found?

Mr. TAFT. On page 11. In that provision the War Production Board is given extensive power. The bill now steps outside the Director of War Mobilization and Adjustment, and goes to the War Production Board. The bill provides that it shall permit the expansion of plans and shall have the right to tell the War Department it must permit civilian production to resume. Conceivably, we might give that power to the over-all Director of Mobilization such as Mr. Byrnes; but certainly I do not think Congress wishes to bestow upon the War Production Board the right to say that a certain industry shall now begin to operate, even though the War Department thinks its operation will interfere with the successful prosecution of the war.

When we reach page 11 we find that the Murray-Kilgore bill begins to interfere with the whole operation of the termination-of-contracts bill. For instance, on page 12, in paragraph (2), the Director is authorized to—

(2) Establish policies and procedures to be followed by the contracting agencies in the curtailment, nonrenewal, and termination of contracts, to include as he may deem necessary the submission of detailed programs for approval.

So that having passed the contract-termination bill and having worked it out with the House at great length, the Senate is now asked to proceed to give someone else the power to change the whole thing; and by subsection (d), on page 13, we would even repeal a part of the contract-termination bill. Of course the George bill does none of that.

I do not intend to deal with the whole question of unemployment compensation, but we come to the question of the Work Administrator and the powers which are given to him. He is under a general director, but he is given these extensive powers:

The Work Administrator shall prescribe regulations and issue directives to Federal agencies necessary to effectuate the objectives of this title and all such Federal agencies shall be governed by these.

He is given power to prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of the title. Every court of which I know would consider that to be a delegation of legislative power to make regulations having the effect of law.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me suggest that the Senate is not in order. In particular, let me request that conferences which are being held be held outside the Chamber, rather than in it. There has been confusion for half an hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what are the objectives of that title? The first objective is—

(a) To facilitate the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war.

In other words, by regulations to effectuate "the objectives of this title," the Work Administrator can clearly prescribe a national service act. He may do anything "to facilitate the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war." The War Manpower Commission is doing something along that line without much authority; but once this bill is enacted into law, the Work Administrator, it seems to me, may issue any order he pleases regarding the impressment of men into work, requiring them to work, drafting them for any work he sees fit.

The second objective is—

(b) To maintain maximum employment in the transition from war to peacetime production.

Under that it appears to me that the Work Administrator could prescribe regulations for a complete P. W. A. and could establish a P. W. A.

We have talked about abolishing bureaus. The Work Administrator could establish more bureaus, under the Murray-Kilgore bill, than the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] could abolish in the course of 3 years of the hardest kind of work.

The third objective is—

(c) To provide for the coordination of the demobilization of servicemen with employment opportunities under a policy of demobilizing servicemen as rapidly as the military situation permits.

The Work Administrator could issue regulations binding the Army and Navy as to exactly how they should proceed to demobilize servicemen.

The fourth objective is—

(d) To provide necessary training of ex-servicemen and war workers.

Under that objective the Work Administrator could certainly set up a new and bigger N. Y. A., and could proceed to set up a general Federal plan of training—an N. Y. A., or a C. C. C., or any other bureau he might see fit to set up.

The fifth objective, finally, is—

(e) To provide the necessary economic assistance to returning ex-servicemen and war workers in connection with transfer, training, and reemployment.

In other words, he may authorize any spending he sees fit to authorize and may set up any bureau to engage in such spending.

The only restraint which I can see on the Work Administrator is that if he wishes to spend some money, of course he has to come back to the Congress to get the appropriations in order to have the money to spend. But we have seen how effective that restraint is in trying to check the establishment of bureaus. Bureau after bureau has been set up in the Government during the war without any authority from Congress. I do not know how they financed themselves for the time being, but finally they have come to Congress and have obtained the financing necessary to enable them to continue.

Of course, Mr. President, the Murray-Kilgore bill goes further than unemployment compensation. It provides for transportation; namely—

The Work Administrator is hereby authorized to pay the cost of transportation of workers and ex-servicemen, including transportation of dependents and household effects, from their last previous residence to new jobs, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Work Administrator.

That seems to me to give the Work Administrator power for the next 3 years to move people all over the United States at Government expense. Whenever a man wanted a new job, or the Administrator thinks there ought to be more workmen in one place, and fewer in another, any workman could be moved back and forth across the country.

Under the George bill he would be permitted merely to obtain the money in order to return home. If he did not wish to go home he could indicate one other place to which he wished to go. As I read the George bill, there would be only one payment to those who are away from home and are offered transportation to

their homes. In my opinion, there may be cases in which a number of persons will be stranded at a plant in the country, or at some place in the desert, and there should be authority by which relief could be granted in that kind of a situation and the persons who are stranded in those places brought back to the places from which they came. But under the Kilgore bill there would be an indefinite power granted for the next 3 years to move people all over the United States at Government expense.

Under paragraph (b) of section 306 there is the following language:

The United States Employment Service shall be continued as a nationally operated system of public employment offices for a period of 2 years after the termination of hostilities as proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

That means that the U. S. E. S. is to be continued for 2 years. The Congress is asked to tie its hands as to any further disposition. I see no reason why any provision of that kind should be made at the present time. The United States Employment Service is now proceeding under war powers. It will continue until the termination of hostilities, and then there should be worked out a joint State pay-roll employment system so that the matter of employment can be turned back to the States, to be operated in connection with the unemployment-compensation bureaus of the various States. That is what every State wants. The States turned over those powers only because the President demanded it following Pearl Harbor. He insisted upon the transfer being made, and nearly every Governor stipulated that the powers should be returned to the States just as soon as the war came to an end.

The next provision dealing with vocational training has been somewhat changed by the amendment which has been offered. So far as I can see, however, it is not substantially different. It still provides for 6 months of training, Government compensation at the rate of \$50 a month for a man without dependents, \$75 a month if he has one dependent, and \$100 a month if he has two or more dependents. Those rates apply while he is engaged in receiving 6 months of vocational training.

Of course, we supply educational facilities to soldiers. But I am unable to see the parallel between soldiers and workmen who have already been engaged in war work, and who presumably have learned the general character of the work in which they have been engaged. They have learned and are familiar with a trade. I feel confident that in nearly every case those men are prepared to look after their own training, or to go to the State training institutions which have been established and are supported partly by Federal funds. Some time ago, last year, as I recall, Congress passed a retraining and rehabilitation bill. The bill provided that the Federal Government should give assistance to State systems. Such a provision is entirely adequate.

The whole attempt to draw a parallel between ex-servicemen and workmen seems to be entirely wrong. Ex-service-

men are serving in the war for as little as \$50 a month. During the same time nearly all civilian workers have been receiving wages which are much higher than were ever before paid in the United States. We have sold more than \$25,000,000,000 worth of E bonds. That amount constitutes a reserve with which to take care of needy people. In addition to that, the currency of the United States has increased from \$6,000,000,000 to \$22,000,000,000, which must represent a very considerable amount of savings in cash.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I remind the distinguished Senator from Ohio that as of last April there was approximately \$107,000,000,000 in our banks, representing \$10,000,000,000 of Government funds, plus about \$62,000,000,000 of demand deposits, and \$34,000,000,000 plus of savings deposits.

Mr. TAFT. That should be added in part to the currency and to the E bonds to which I have referred in estimating civilian savings. The Army and Navy put on a drive for the sale of E bonds, and they have received excellent responses, considering what the soldiers receive in the way of wages, but the actual amount of bonds sold to the soldiers and sailors as of today is about \$815,000,000. While the men and women in the service have been able to buy \$315,000,000 worth of bonds, the people at home, because of the wages which they have been receiving, have been able to buy approximately \$24,500,000,000 worth of E bonds. Certainly no parallel can be drawn between what the Government owes to the servicemen and what it owes to workmen who have been working in war industries at reasonable civilian wages and, in many cases, high wages.

The mustering-out pay, which was provided by the G. I. bill, is proposed to be nearly doubled. It was satisfactory to the soldiers and was worked out in a compromise between the Senate and the House. There seems to be no reason to increase the compensation except that since we are throwing away money to the workmen, it is thought that we must increase the compensation to the soldiers by some parallel provision.

I wish to say a word or two with reference to unemployment compensation. I believe that those who have drawn the pending bill have entirely misconceived the real purpose of unemployment compensation insurance. Unemployment compensation insurance is not supposed to be relief. It is not supposed to meet a great relief crisis. In England and in this country the period during which compensation may be paid is limited to 26 weeks. The payment is in cash. It is intended merely to insure the workman against recurrent periods of unemployment. It has always been contemplated that if it is impossible to get a workman back to work in 6 months, something else must be done.

Nearly every social plan I have ever seen proposes that when the period of 6 months comes to an end provision must then be made for work relief if there still

exists a severe unemployment crisis. Some type of work relief should be worked out between the States and the Government, and if there is any such crisis as that to which I have referred we shall have to develop some plan in order to get men back to work. But the purpose of unemployment compensation is merely insurance. It is intended to give money as an incident to the work which has already been done. Some part of the men's wages has been put aside by the employer in order to create a fund. The argument that we should now undertake to deal with the unemployment insurance problem on the theory that there will be a great depression, is entirely erroneous. It has been pointed out that we attempt to base unemployment insurance on the number of dependents which the beneficiary may have, and that it is not unemployment compensation. What is provided here is not unemployment compensation. It goes beyond the purpose of unemployment compensation. The States have provided what unemployment compensation is to be. The compensation may be low in some States, but living costs may be low in some States. When a man is receiving something without working there is always the danger that he may make no effort to obtain work, and many of the States have felt that the compensation should not be more than \$15 a week. I believe that the increase in living costs warrant the compensation being increased to \$20 a week in some States, and in other States to \$25. But that is a matter for the States to determine.

If we are to provide for relief we must do something entirely different. We cannot do it merely by paying people a dole. If there is to be any such unemployment as has been suggested here, we must provide some great general plan of work relief.

Furthermore, unemployment is a very uncertain term. No one has ever made a very satisfactory census of unemployment. Should every man who wants a job be counted as unemployed? Are we to undertake to provide work for two, three, and possibly four workers in a family even though one man in the family has a very good job? What about the two or three million housewives who have been working in the shops? Strictly speaking, when they return to their homes and give up work they should not be counted as unemployed. I do not know whether they are included in Mr. Altmeyer's figures, but it seems quite obvious that if the wife of a soldier was working while her husband was abroad, and discontinued her employment after he returned home, she should not be counted as unemployed. Yet if she lists her name as willing to take work she will get that benefit for anywhere from 3 to 5 years, because obviously there is not going to be work for those women. There is always going to be a priority for servicemen, anyway. So she can with perfect safety list her name for work and be quite confident she is not going to be required to work. So I say that this bill in its general dishing out of money to everybody goes far beyond any purpose of unemployment compensation.

Mr. President, we face a tremendous Budget after the war. The most conservative estimate of Government expenditures after the war I have seen is \$17,000,000,000 a year. I think \$20,000,000,000 is much closer to it. There will be \$6,000,000,000 for interest alone in all probability; there will be four or five billion dollars for current Government expenses; there will be at least \$5,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy on a permanent basis. I discussed the matter last night with a man who is familiar with it who thinks the Army and Navy are planning on a post-war expenditure of from seven to eight billion dollars, instead of \$5,000,000,000. I would hope it could be held to \$5,000,000,000. Under the plan we have adopted, we are certainly going to pay at least \$2,000,000,000 a year for the veterans for hospitalization alone. The bill for the last war is about \$600,000,000, and I should think that, without considering the provisions of the G. I. bill, except as to hospital service, there will be required \$2,000,000,000 a year for hospitalization as a permanent feature. Many of the provisions of the G. I. bill are simply temporary, which perhaps we can charge to the cost of the war. So, in my opinion, we are going to have an annual Government expenditure of \$20,000,000,000, and no one, so far as I know, has devised a tax measure that will raise that much money. I do not know how it is going to be raised. The present tax bill raises about \$45,000,000,000 a year on a national income of \$150,000,000,000, which cannot possibly be continued. If the national income is reduced to \$120,000,000,000, the present tax system might raise something like \$25,000,000,000, but certainly everyone agrees that it will be necessary to cut the taxes on individuals; it will be necessary to cut the taxes on corporations if the people are to have opportunity to work at all, if industry is to be stimulated. There are various plans. One proposes to cut corporation taxes and another wants to cut the individual taxes, but if we are going to raise anything like seventeen or twenty billion dollars of revenue, we are bound to have a very heavy tax burden under any circumstances.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not obvious from what the able Senator has just said that the only way to bring about an adequate revenue is to get a higher national income?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is obviously true. The only way a country can be prosperous is to remain prosperous. That is all the Senator's suggestion implies, because that is how the national income is maintained. If the implication is that we can get a large national income on a permanent basis by spending more money, I think the implication is entirely wrong. I think obviously we must levy taxes that will meet our necessities. It is said that many new things must be done by the Federal Government

because the States cannot do it. It is said they cannot do it because they have not the taxing power. Therefore, it has to be done by Federal taxation. But what evidence is there that we can raise more than \$20,000,000,000 a year in normal peacetimes without choking incentive to death? Who has devised such a system? What is the basis of assumption that the Federal Government can find a tax system to give it unlimited money to spend for every single purpose?

I believe very strongly that if we are to be successful at all, we must limit Government expenditures. We cannot go on collecting vast sums of billions of dollars year after year to be paid out by the Government to individuals throughout the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Do I understand correctly that the distinguished Senator has expressed the opinion that we will not be able to maintain a national income of \$150,000,000,000 in peacetimes?

Mr. TAFT. I certainly do. If we can go over \$120,000,000,000, I shall be very much surprised. We have a \$150,000,000,000 national income, superinduced by Government spending amounting to \$90,000,000,000 a year. That will be cut to \$20,000,000,000, we will say, and the other purchasing power cannot be replaced, in my opinion. I am hoping that we can get to \$120,000,000,000, but I do not think we can go above \$120,000,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I further ask of the distinguished Senator if it is not agreed by economists both from the conservative and the radical group, as well as by industrialists, that general employment in the United States in the post-war era on a 40-hour week, with the soldiers returned and the women and other extraordinary workers out of employment, would produce within a year or two \$150,000,000,000 national income?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think that is agreed at all. I do not see how we can possibly tell whether we can employ all the people who want work or not until we actually try it. I hope we can. Obviously we cannot employ them at present day take-home wages. That is an impossibility on the basis of anybody's figures.

In any event, my point is that we are going to have a tremendous tax burden at best. If we go on in anything like this bill, we are going to wreck the United States; there can be no question about that. Either the tax burden will be so heavy that industry cannot operate—and if the present corporation tax structure is maintained there will be no incentive to go into business or to continue in old business—or the business tax burden will be so heavy as gradually to destroy private enterprise and cause the Government to take over, thereby bringing about a form of State socialism. Or resort will be had to the alternative philosophy, which the proponents of this bill seem to espouse, of borrowing money at a rate of from ten to twenty billion

dollars a year and increase the national debt by that amount. That would mean real inflation.

We have had a hard enough time to hold prices to present levels because of the Government deficit. People are willing to save and submit to controls in time of war but they will never submit to them in times of peace. If we continue with a deficit of \$15,000,000,000 a year—and that is about what it is—we will undoubtedly force prices up until there is brought about complete inflation, which will wreck our whole economic system. If we are going to go forward we will have to balance the budget. We are going to have a hard enough time to deal with a debt of \$300,000,000,000, and if we are going to add to it constantly every year it will not be very long until the whole structure breaks down.

We must consider all the proposed expenditures. That proposed by this bill is only one; there are a dozen other bills proposing expenditures of billions of dollars which, if they are all enacted by the Congress, will build up to something like an annual budget of \$50,000,000,000 a year, and if we start in peacetime with that kind of a budget we will find there is nothing left of this country and the institutions under which we have grown up with and which incidentally have made this country the rich and powerful and successful nation it is.

Mr. President, the Murray-Kilgore bill violates every principle of sound government in the post-war era. In the first place, it suppresses local self-government; it places in the Federal Government all control of labor, all control of unemployment compensation, all control of reemployment. In the second place, it delegates complete legislative power. I suppose there is no Senator here who has not said he is in favor of Congress passing the laws and not giving the power to some bureaucrat to do so. Yet it is proposed, by the pending bill, simply to hand over to some bureaucrat the power to make any law and, in effect, do anything he thinks necessary to help in this supposed post-war emergency.

In the third place, it would destroy individual liberty, because it would impose an N. R. A. control over all industry, and impose a work administrator's control over all individuals.

Finally, it proposes unlimited spending. It adopts the theory that every problem we have to meet is to be solved simply by more Government power and more Government spending.

There is no Member of the Senate who has not talked against bureaucracy and the establishment of bureaus, yet here it is proposed that we establish a whole series of new bureaus to deal with every problem which Congress itself has not adequately considered.

The alternative, the George bill, is a simple bill which does no more than provide the implementation of the Baruch plan and the report of the George post-war committee made last spring, which was very much in accord with the Baruch plan. We can solve our problems by sound principles just as well as we can by some kind of Federal

panacea of spending. We have an existing system of State unemployment compensation. There has been built up \$6,000,000,000 in the unemployment compensation funds to take care of just the emergency that is contemplated. If it is thought the benefits are not adequate, why does not the C. I. O. go to the State legislatures? I have no doubt that the same pressure that is being brought here, if brought on the State legislatures, would produce a \$20 weekly wage in any legislature I can think of, because it is recognized that the benefits may have been low, that costs of living have gone up, and that \$20 is reasonable.

The George bill provides simple power to the Work Administrator to go over the whole retraining problem and submit further recommendations to the Congress, if it seems that the present system should be expanded. But there is a State system of vocational education, there is a retraining system already established, supported in part by Federal funds. We do not have to give the Work Administrator power to set up an entirely new system, and the George bill does not do that.

In general, what American workmen want is opportunity to find jobs. They do not want to be ordered around. I do not believe they are interested in more unemployment compensation. Most of them have saved their money. They want to take a little vacation in their own time, and then look for the jobs they want, and they want to do that by themselves. What is proposed by the George bill is that the Federal Government give them the information necessary, and assist them to obtain employment. That is what the American workman has always done, and that is what he will do after the present war.

Finally, the George bill provides no vast plan of Federal spending. Altogether it would add somewhat less than a billion dollars to the total expenditures after the war, and it would not provide for that permanently, because the expenditure will have to be taken up by unemployment compensation taxes. The Federal Government will have to figure hereafter, when it employs people, that it will have to pay some unemployment compensation insurance, so that Federal employees will also have insurance.

Mr. President, in the Murray-Kilgore bill we have a plan which would be absolutely destructive of the entire American economy after the war. As against that we have the George bill which implements the Baruch report and gives the Government power to deal with the situation in an intelligent American way. This plan will, I feel confident, be far more likely to produce prosperity and jobs than a plan which will be advertised as a general Government attempt to continue complete regulation and lavish Government spending for at least 3 years after the termination of the war with Germany.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the action of the Senate on the pending bill will indicate to the country, and particularly to those affected by it, the attitude of the present Congress toward the post-war problems which are rushing toward

us. The decision we make upon the controversial part of the bill will be a fair signpost to those who are watching Congress to see how well we are going to guide the country through that very dangerous period. If the Congress shall indicate, in the first approach to those problems, that it is thinking more in terms of dollars than in terms of human lives, human standards of living, and human happiness, we will be choosing the material over human and spiritual values in our great national life.

Mr. President, I am sorry the able Senator from Ohio did not spend more of his time in discussing what are the real essentials of the bill, rather than the part of it which might be called the verbiage; what, it might be said, are the leaves as compared to the trunk of the tree.

The Senate has before it two measures. The base bill is the George bill, and the other proposal is the Murray-Kilgore bill. The George bill as originally presented to the Senate provided for Federal loan funds to be made available to the several States in case they depleted their unemployment-compensation funds. In addition to that, it blanketed into coverage, under unemployment-compensation provisions, certain classes of our people—Federal workers and others—totaling, we will say, three and a half million of our citizens. That, essentially, is all the bill attempted to accomplish.

The Murray-Kilgore bill, on the other hand, endeavored to present a comprehensive plan, a comprehensive program and procedure, which would attack the post-war problem upon all fronts, and endeavor successfully to meet the dangerous challenge of that time.

It provided in title I machinery by which the Federal Government might effectively deal with that problem, for we here in this Congress had seen the necessity for coordinating the activities and the authority of the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. We saw this Nation launched into this great war without such centralized authority, without such a coordinating agency in the Federal Government. We saw the person of the President of the United States as the only one who could reconcile the conflict and the clash of several agencies and formulate a program and a policy for the Government of the people of the United States.

Here in the Senate, Mr. President, there was initiated long ago a war mobilization proposal which contemplated the necessity of setting up, other than in the person of the President, some authority in Washington which could fully mobilize the power and the might of the Federal Government. Before that proposal was enacted into legislation the President by Executive order provided for setting up the War Mobilization Board, and appointed as its Director and Chairman the able Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes, and everyone will admit that since that was done there has been a great improvement in the efficiency and the effectiveness of our governmental effort and in the waging and the winning of the war.

I could tell from my own experience of case after case in which the Government of the United States was utterly frustrated, incapable of accomplishing such a small task as getting some barges built to put on the inland waterways of this country with which to move petroleum in a period of great petroleum shortage. Six different Federal agencies, each having a limited sphere of authority and power, were unable to have any barges built because there was not any one person in Washington who could bring them all together to get the job done.

So, all of us, Mr. President, were convinced that if we were to meet effectively the post-war challenge, the Government of the United States, if it were to act at all, had to have authority vested in some individual other than a busy President, who could bring together all the various agencies into a single and harmonious policy and program. That is what the Murray-Kilgore bill provided in title I.

Later on, when the George amendment to the Murray-Kilgore measure was proposed to the Senate, something comparable to that was embodied in the amendment of the able Senator from Georgia, recognizing the same necessity, and I commend the able Senator for his usual enterprise and enlightened course in also embodying in his measure a similar provision on that subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Downey in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator permit me to say that many months ago I introduced, together with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], a bill numbered as S. 1730, which did deal with these problems.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to have the Senator make that statement. Of course he has always been forward-looking in respect to such matters. What I wanted to say was that we are in substantial agreement now concerning the necessity of setting up some broad authority in our Government to mobilize the full might of the Government of the United States in meeting the challenging post-war problems.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to quibble or to quarrel as to whether title I of the Murray-Kilgore bill or title I of the George amendment is preferable or more perfect in setting up this form of machinery. I dare say that either one of them would do an excellent job, and both sponsors are to be commended for coming so nearly to a common course upon the details and being so nearly in accord with respect to the principles which should apply in setting up such an agency.

The George amendment, provided for in the Murray-Kilgore bill, eliminates the deputy director. It is almost a superhuman job for the director personally to attend to all the jobs that will come before him in his capacity as director. I think it is wise for us to give him a dep-

uty director to whom he may delegate a measure of his authority. I believe it will result in more effective action if we do so; but whether we do that or not is of relatively little importance as to the essentials of this measure.

Title II, Mr. President, in both the George amendment and in the Murray-Kilgore bill, provides for what is called industrial demobilization and reconversion. There again, Mr. President, the sponsors of both measures realize the necessity of coordinating our production program for war with our demobilization program, and the stimulation of our peace economy in the days after our great victory. So, while I think some may have a legitimate preference for one or the other, it is not very vital to the essentials of the program whether we adopt one title II or the other title II, so far as the economy of this country after the war is concerned.

I proceed, therefore, Mr. President, to the essential part of this controversy, title III, in the Murray-Kilgore bill, as compared with title III in the George amendment. Title III of the Murray-Kilgore bill provides four essentials about which I wish to speak. The first is this: Title III of the Murray-Kilgore bill provides a period of training not to exceed 6 months for a civilian employed in this country, or a veteran who has had less than 90 days' service on active duty, and therefore is not eligible for the training provided by the G. I. bill. In this category I include soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, who served in the war, and the ladies who served in the auxiliary branches, but who served less than 90 days and are not eligible for the training provided in the G. I. bill; any such individual, or any qualified employee, as provided in the Murray-Kilgore bill, which means practically every employee in the United States, save the self-employed and save the domestic worker, is entitled to be provided by the Work Administrator with training up to 6 months.

Why? For what purpose? In order that the man or woman, the boy or girl, may be taught skills which will enable them to make a decent living, to be better citizens, and to enrich the economy of this great country. That is what it is for. We have discovered what can be done in a short period of effective training. We have trained literally tens of millions of our men and women so as to enable them to go from one job to another. We have made use of their latent capacity. We have taken a farm boy and made a mechanic of him. We have taken a girl who never worked outside the household and made her an efficient welder. We have taken the mother and the housewife who had never had experience outside the home, and have made her an effective and gallant soldier for winning the war. That is what we have done. We have discovered that by using the money and the means of the Federal Government, we can transform a nation of unemployed to a gallant army of war workers, doing the greatest job war workers ever have done in the history of the world. That is why that provision is in the Murray-Kilgore bill. We

have seen now how quickly an individual can be trained to be a welder or mechanic or a craftsman or artisan. We have taken individuals out of their homes. We have taken them from their fields and their farms. We have taken them from the counter behind which they clerked. We have taken them out of the offices and the stores. We have taken them from the highways, Mr. President. Now those individuals must find their way back to the paths of peace. They must find an opportunity again to help their country, which is still concerned about their contribution to its security and prosperity. The Murray-Kilgore measure says to the workers of America, "We also value what you can do for your country in the days of peace comparable to what you have accomplished in our period of war crisis."

Mr. President, it is easy for a Senator drawing \$10,000 a year, living the rather comfortable life that we Senators live, rather above the hardships of the little people for whom we are trying to legislate in this measure, to say "Very well, let these folks find their own way." Yes, Mr. President, we can let them find their own way. Where will that way lead them? It will lead the masses of them to impecuniousness and to poverty. It will lead them to the bread lines. It will lead them to another W. P. A., Mr. President, where they will have to meet the humiliating conditions of a means test. It will lead them to continued poverty, to continued ill-health, to continued ill-housing. It will lead them to keep their children out of school. We as well as they will pay the price of the sacrifice to which it will condemn them.

Mr. President, I say we have made a sensible proposal in the Murray-Kilgore measure. Let us say to these war workers, "You have learned how to be a welder, you have learned how to be a mechanic, you have learned to build a ship, you have learned to build a tank, you have learned to build an airplane. Now we want to teach you how to build radar for homes in days of peace. We want to teach you how to build instruments for television. We want to teach you how to build more radios than we have ever had. We want to teach you how to build the best automobiles and the best airplanes. We want to teach you how to build prefabricated houses. We want to teach you how to carry on the greatest economy on earth, to build the prosperity of the United States of America. We are teaching you to help the Nation while you help yourselves."

What is proposed, therefore, Mr. President, is that we say now, under the supervision of the program by the Federal Work Administrator, "You may have up to 6 months' training, but while you are receiving such training we will provide for your subsistence. You must eat, you must have a place to sleep, you must have a shelter over your head, you must have medical care, and even a little recreation. We will give that to you for a 6-months' period."

Mr. President, do Senators wish to say to the war workers of their States, "No; we will not give you that"? Do Senators wish to say to the people of their coun-

try in the days which lie ahead, "We will deprive you of what those retrained men and women can build for you, in things as well as in money and wealth"? Is that profligacy, Mr. President, or is that a wise investment in the greatest field of investment that has ever been in the vista before human eyes? That is God's field of investment, men, women, and children. Yet, Mr. President, our friends, in the name of economy, in the name of statesmanship, in the name of States' rights, will deny, if they prevail, those opportunities to the men and women, boys and girls of America.

Let me comment upon the much used term "States' rights." I think the greatest right in all the world is the right of a man, woman, or child to what the Constitution of the United States guarantees him—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and any right which contravenes that right that man is heir to is an inferior right, Mr. President. Whether it be the right of a State or the asserted right of anyone else, it must take a position subordinate to the greater right of men, women, and children to live fruitful and righteous lives with their fellow men under their God.

Many of us have had to make a choice between property rights and human rights. Any man who sits in the Senate must make that decision many times. If we must now make a choice between so-called States' rights and human rights, many of us will find it an easy choice to make.

That is the first thing, the retraining program, which the George amendment, for reasons satisfactory to the sponsor, does not afford. The second is the mustering-out pay benefit, which the Murray-Kilgore bill provides to the veterans of our wars. Let me read a paragraph which will summarize the situation as it now exists, as it would be should the Murray-Kilgore bill become law.

I add that the George amendment does not provide a penny of additional mustering-out pay for any veteran. It does not deal with the subject at all. It leaves the matter just where it was and is in the legislation which is already enacted.

The Mustering-Out Pay Act of February 1944 provides a payment of \$100 for a service man or woman with less than 60 days' service. That is the existing law. It provides \$200 for those with more than 60 days' service, and \$300 for those who serve overseas. That is the present law. That is what a veteran will receive if the Murray-Kilgore bill is not enacted into law.

But if the Murray-Kilgore bill should become law, these are the benefits which the veteran would receive:

Equal monthly installments would be paid at the rate of \$100 if the serviceman were without dependents; \$125 if he had one dependent; and \$150 if he had two or more dependents. Every serviceman would receive a minimum of two installments. That means that if he were single, with no dependents, he would receive two installments of \$100 each, or a total of \$200, with an additional installment for each year of active service.

If he remained in the service for a year on active duty he would receive another \$100, which would make \$300. Then he would receive another installment for every year of overseas service. If that year of active service were a year of overseas service, he would receive another \$100, which would make \$400.

So at the present time, and under the present law, a veteran would receive \$300 if he were on active duty and overseas for 1 year; and if the Murray-Kilgore bill should become law, and he were on active duty and overseas for 1 year, he would receive \$400. If he had dependents he would receive more. There is therefore a reasonable increase in the mustering-out pay which the veteran would receive.

Thus every serviceman, under the Murray-Kilgore bill, would receive at least \$200, as compared with the \$100 minimum to which he is now entitled, while a serviceman with two dependents who had seen a year of active service any part of which was overseas would receive \$600 as compared with the \$300 to which he is entitled under existing law.

It is not grossly unfair to say that this bill would approximately double the mustering-out pay for the veterans of this war. There again, those who believe in economy, those who think they are conservative statesmen, those who desire to legislate with caution, say, "That is too much. That is too high a reward for a soldier." We dare to say that, Mr. President! That is too much for a man who was at Cassino, or Corregidor, or Bataan, a man who fell from the sky like an eagle with a broken wing, a man who was a prisoner of war, a man who was in Normandy, a man who finally, Mr. President, will be in Tokyo or Berlin! That is too much?

I do not care whether every conservative in America thinks it is too much or not. It is only a question of time when they will get it. We can choose to delay until they take it, or give to them as a matter of grace and gratitude, Mr. President; but believe me, they will come and get it. God speed the day when they will come. This time the kind of government which the people have in Washington will determine whether they are to be met with open arms and recognized, or whether, at the point of a bayonet, they are to be driven out of the Nation's Capital, to which they come to exercise the right of petition. That happened once, and I have heard that history repeats itself. Let us hope it will not. For the security of America, I venture to believe it had better not happen.

I believe that the maximum benefit under the Murray-Kilgore bill would be about \$1,000. Do Senators remember the days when statesmen rose in this body and in stentorian tones said that America would be ruined and wrecked if we paid the bonus to the soldiers of the last war? I believe it was to have cost \$2,000,000,000 or \$3,000,000,000 to pay the bonus. It became a great political issue. Everyone who was in favor of paying the bonus was regarded almost as a Communist. An expenditure of

\$2,000,000,000 or \$3,000,000,000 to pay the bonus was going to wreck the economy of the United States. That simply goes to show how shortsighted the people were just a little while ago. I wonder if we are going to be as shortsighted in the Senate in this good year 1944. Yet today Senators are honestly agitated about a maximum benefit of \$1,000 to a prisoner on Bataan, a man who was in "the death march." Whether this bill passes or falls to pass, 5 or 10 years from now some Senator will rise in his place and say, "My colleagues, can you believe that back in 1944, in the age of congressional obsolescence, Senators actually said that it was too much to pay \$400 to a soldier who had 8 months in Italy, or had been across Africa, or had marched, with a plume flying as high as that of Henry of Navarre, toward the enemy's bastions"? That is just an observation, Mr. President.

So that is the second provision which is contained in the Murray-Kilgore bill which the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has not incorporated in his amendment.

Third, Mr. President, is the question whether the veteran's dependents are given some recognition. Under existing law, the G. I. bill of rights, which provides for unemployment compensation to the veteran, a veteran with no dependents receives \$20 a week—a flat sum—no more, no less. A veteran with a wife and five children receives no more, no less. But the Senate did not pass the G. I. bill of rights that way. In the G. I. bill the Senate passed it provided for exactly the benefits the Murray-Kilgore bill provides. It allows up to \$15 a week extra for the dependents of the veteran.

So a veteran who has a wife and who, therefore, has one dependent, under the Murray-Kilgore bill would not receive \$20 a week, as the G. I. bill of rights provides, but would receive \$25 a week. A veteran with a wife and one child, or with two dependents, would not receive \$20 a week, as provided for under the present G. I. bill, but would receive \$30 a week for those two dependents. Under the Murray-Kilgore bill a veteran with a wife and two children, or with more than two children, would not receive \$20 a week, as now provided under the present G. I. bill, but would receive \$35 a week. Mr. President, \$15 a week multiplied by 4 weeks is \$60 a month, which, at least, would be provided by the Murray-Kilgore bill for the veteran's family.

But under the present law, Mr. President, when the veteran comes home, even if he is unemployed because he cannot get a job, he and his family will receive less than they are now receiving. That is simple arithmetic. Today the dependent of a soldier or sailor—his wife—receives \$50 a month for herself. She receives \$30 a month for the first child and \$20 a month for each additional child. Therefore, if she has two children she receives \$100 a month. I believe the soldier keeps \$28 for his own immediate needs, and the rest of the allowance received by his family is taken from his pay. But we see that the soldier with his \$28 a month and the wife with \$100 a

month for herself and their two children are now receiving a total of \$128 a month, plus the allowances for the soldier's food, clothing, and hospitalization. But even if the soldier has a wife and six children waiting for him when he returns from the war, and if when he returns he finds that, through no fault of his own, he is unable to get a job, the maximum amount of money that family would have to live on would be \$80 a month under the provisions of the G. I. bill. We propose to increase that allowance.

Again the issue is presented. Is it doing too much to give a maximum of \$145 a month to a man who has risked his all and to a wife and two or more children who waited behind in those dark hours of anguish and concern for him, waiting for him to come back? Mr. President, it does not mean much to the Government of the United States. There are some Senators so fortunate that it does not mean much to them if they have \$15 more or less a month. But to many families it determines the nourishment their bodies will have, not to say whether they will get to go to a picture show, whether the children will receive the care of a dentist, whether they will receive the care of a doctor, or whether they will receive care at a hospital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Along the line of the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida, an instance of what he has described is called to my mind. A week ago Saturday night there came to my home a soldier of the United States Army who left a little town in New Mexico, and left there his wife and seven children. I know that the income of that poor soldier in the little country town in which he lives does not reach \$500 a year; but still, when he goes to do his duty, and leaves his family, we worry about what small amount of money Uncle Sam is going to give them.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word of commendation for the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. He is a modest and unassuming gentleman. I do not know whether he will be permanently displeased with me for mentioning it, but I should like to say that I understand the Senator from Montana personally is a very rich man. He has in his heart the milk of human sympathy and kindness, and his liberal record in the Senate has shown a solicitude for the privations of others, with which he has had no personal experience, at least not in his later life. I am glad to see that. I think the country has a great deal for which to feel a little ashamed when it comes to its treatment of these boys who have had so little and who have been asked to give so much to the society which has given them so little.

Mr. President, in this country in 1939, of all men and women fully employed and paid by wages or salaries 50 percent received less than \$100 a month. What kind of a standard of living did that in-

come provide, even on the average, let alone for those at the bottom of the ladder?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We speak a great deal about the American standard of living, but standards are based upon the capacity to keep up. In view of the wages which have been paid in the past and in view of the income of the average American citizens, how can they keep up the American standard of living?

Mr. PEPPER. It is absolutely impossible.

Mr. President, I have before me some items to indicate the budget of the average American family. Senators who are in opposition to the stand I and other Senators with similar views take propose that the veteran and his family shall live on \$80 a month. Even if the veteran has only himself to maintain, what kind of a standard of living can he have when he receives \$80 a month? If he has a wife, what kind of a house can he and his wife live in? He is a man who should be one of the prime heroes of the earth—an American soldier. What kind of shelter, what kind of food, what kind of clothes can he have? Mr. President, we would not do too much if we put that man on a pedestal, so as to assure that wherever he went people would doff their hats and would say, "There goes an American soldier," or "an American sailor," or "an American marine," or "an American airman." Yet we say to him and his wife, or to him and his wife and two children, or to him and his wife and three children, or to him and his wife and four children, or to him and his wife and five children, "\$80 a month is what you get."

Well, Mr. President, it is going to be one of the great dramas of history when these boys return. The other day I read the story of one of these boys who, with his own hands, had slain over 60 Germans in combat. He returned to this country, and suddenly, without her knowing, he was in America, burst in upon his "mom" in his old home. We can imagine the electric emotions which swept between that returning son and that longing mother. His next mental step would be to look around, and to say to himself, "This is how mom lives in the country for which I offered my life out there in those trenches and fox holes. This is how little brother lives. This is my sister's lot. This is my old dad's pittance—the pittance that he has for his security." Those boys are going to do a lot of thinking, Mr. President. Those boys are not going to be concerned about themselves. The newspaper account says that the particular boy to whom I have referred had his pocket picked in Naples, and came home broke.

I hope that someone—and I am sure they did when they heard the story—had the great satisfaction of sending an anonymous check with the message, "Go and enjoy yourself, from somebody who appreciates you." But, Mr. President, when he finally returns home to look around, and is unable to find a job, he will go down to the office of the Federal

Government and they will say to him, "Here, son, here is your first payment at the rate of \$20 a week." He will have a little experience with it. It will be all right for the first few days, perhaps, but after a month has passed, and he has to give up the house in which his wife lived during his absence, or his wife is compelled to reduce the standard of board at the table, or the family budget is reduced, then the story will be a different one. Many soldiers will not complain. But eventually there will come a time when the soldier to whom I am referring will lie awake. There will perhaps be an explosion out in the street. He will jump and take in his arms his children and tremble. Then he will become calm and will meditate and will reflect. Next day he will meet some fellows down at the corner, perhaps, who are not quite so stable as he, and they will tell him about their lot and their affairs, and they will say things that he will not like. We are not brewing stability, Mr. President, when we say that those men shall receive less than what is their right and due.

So whether we are right or wrong, the issue is, Shall we do what the Senate did once before and provide for the dependents of veterans? The choice is a simple one, because Senators will recall that the amendment sponsored by the able Senator from Georgia is not a divided one, but it is whole. We are to vote for titles I, II, and III as provided for in the Murray-Kilgore bill, or for titles I, II, and III as presented by the able Senator from Georgia. That is the third thing, Mr. President, which goes to the heart of the controversy.

The fourth is the matter of unemployment compensation. Mr. President, we all know that in 1935, not the State legislatures, mind you, but the Congress of the United States, enacted legislation which led to the establishment of the unemployment compensation systems in the several States. In effect the Congress said to the States, "If you will set up unemployment compensation programs, and if you will meet nine Federal conditions"—and I am speaking on the basis of the law which I have in my hand, and on the basis of the conversation which I had this morning with the chairman of the Social Security Board—we will assist you. Those nine conditions do not directly relate to the qualifications of those who will receive unemployment compensation, but it is very directly required that the administration of the various State laws, financed by the Federal Government, shall be under Federal standards. So, Mr. President, it is no new thing to the States to have the Federal Government say, "These are standards which are in the public interest and which you must meet if you receive Federal money."

For purposes satisfactory to itself, the Congress decided that a large measure of autonomy should be granted to the States in connection with the administration of the unemployment compensation laws. I think the Congress, under the conditions existing at that time, and at the beginning of the experiment, acted wisely. The States by now have all

adopted workmen's unemployment compensation laws.

But, Mr. President, it will be recalled that the several States have limited the amount which is to be made available to an unemployed worker, and the period of time covered by the unemployment compensation. In other words, there is a limit on the amount which the unemployed worker may receive, and the time within which he may receive it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated that he would like to see an increase in the amounts payable under the States' administration of unemployment compensation. He said that he would like to see the amount increased to \$20 a week or even to \$25 a week. Can the Senator from Florida inform us as to how any such increase in the payments of benefits by the States could be accomplished?

Mr. PEPPER. The only way in which any increases can be made in the amounts now paid by the States is by the State legislatures meeting and enacting laws providing for the increase. The amendment of the able Senator from Georgia would not in any way effect any increase in the present amounts. The hope has been expressed on the floor that legislatures will act. I am sure that in the bill itself there is language which would encourage action on the part of the States. But, Mr. President, whether the States act or not is left exclusively and entirely to the legislatures of the several States. Generally speaking, we know that the legislatures in this country meet every 2 years. About half of them meet each year. I dare say that they hold their meetings in later winter, in the spring, or in the summer. The legislatures scheduled to meet during 1944 have probably already met. If they have not already provided for the increases to which reference has been made, they could not act for 2 years unless the Governors of the States called special sessions of the legislatures. We have no right to rely upon their doing so, so, Mr. President, the other States, that is, the ones whose legislatures meet next year, will probably do nothing in the meantime. Between now and the time they hold their regular meetings next year there may elapse a period of almost a year, and only about half of the State legislatures will then meet.

Why do I say what I have said, Mr. President? I have before me a schedule showing the benefits paid by the several States to their unemployed, the number of covered workers, the time during which coverage occurs, the number that could be provided for by the funds now in existence, and the percentage of the funds which could be used.

Let us take the State of Alabama. That great State of which I am proud, it being the State of my birth, has 432,000 covered workers. It has \$51,500,000 in the treasury. The maximum which can

be paid under the law to an unemployed worker in Alabama is \$15 a week. The average weekly amount received by the worker in Alabama covered by the law is \$14, and the maximum number of weeks during which he may receive the benefits provided by the law is 20. Alabama has on hand enough money to provide full maximum compensation or coverage to 42 percent of its covered workers. Do the Senators from Alabama wish to say to the workers of that State, "The maximum compensation which you may receive is \$15 a week, no matter how many children you have—and you will be covered only 20 weeks as a maximum," in preference to the benefits under the Murray-Kilgore bill of up to \$35 a week and coverage for as much as 2 years after the end of hostilities?

Let us take a worker in the shipyard in Mobile. If the Murray-Kilgore bill passes and becomes law, and the worker has received \$48 a week, and he has a wife and two children, under the Alabama law he may receive a maximum of \$15 a week for a period of 20 weeks, that is 5 months, Mr. President. That is all he can get until the Alabama legislature meets and enlarges and extends his rights, and until more money is available to the State unemployment compensation fund.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wish to remind the Senator that in the drop to \$15 a week he must, as I understand, be without employment so that it is a time when he cannot be earning.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly. That is all he is getting; and that is all he can hope for.

Mr. President, he is not assured \$15 a week, because the States all have a base period, and he gets a percentage of what his wages were during the base period. In no State to my knowledge is there a minimum assured, and I must add, with some regret, that a minimum is not provided in the present law; but the scale is much higher, so that the worker receiving a given wage will receive much less under the State system than under the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Now, Mr. President, let us take my State of Florida. We have 330,000 covered workers; we have \$39,500,000 in the Treasury; the maximum benefit under our State law is \$15 a week; the average weekly wage of the covered worker is \$13 a week, and the maximum number of weeks for which an unemployed worker could receive benefits is 16, which is 4 months. My legislature meets next April. Should the war end now or in 3 weeks or 3 months and that worker became idle, of course, he would drop down to the benefits under the State law.

The George amendment, as expressed by the able Senator from Michigan, guarantees the solvency of the State fund and that is all. It does not enlarge the State fund unless the State legislature provides for such enlargement, and, if it does, that is still a Federal fund. But there seems to be in the minds of some of our distinguished friends an

opinion about the sacrosanct character of the provision made by the States for the unemployed worker. Mr. President, the State of Florida will be providing unemployment compensation for a worker who has worked in a shipyard in Jacksonville or for one who has worked in a shipyard in Mobile, Ala., or for one who has worked in Philadelphia, Pa., or for one who has worked in a loading plant in Alabama or worked somewhere else. The United States Congress is asked to tell a war worker who helped win this war "Go back to the differentials of your several States, and the Congress of the United States is going to do nothing to equalize your assurance of a livelihood when you get home."

Mr. President, I challenge the premise that the responsibility for preserving a decent standard of living for the American war worker is exclusively that of the States. It was not the States which went to war; it was the Congress and the country as leaders. It was not the States which took the worker and put him in a plant outside his own State. No, Mr. President, thank God, we have one flag for which he has worked in this great war, and the Government of that one flag ought to see to it that he is not discriminated against if he happens to go to any section of this Nation after the war.

I heard an able Senator say here yesterday that we are giving an advantage to the States which are giving the least benefits. I say, Mr. President, we are also penalizing the States that are giving the most benefits. Let us take the great State of California, for example, which has one of the high rates, or let us take the great State of Connecticut, which has the highest rate of pay, \$22 a week to the unemployed worker. Is the worker going to leave Connecticut where he can get \$22 a week while he is unemployed and go to the State of Florida or Alabama or some other State where he will get a great deal less? It will be an impediment to the return of people to their old homes. It will penalize those who made the better provision.

I say, therefore, that what the Murray-Kilgore bill does is right. It says we will fix an American standard of living. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have had to experience humiliation every time a bill came up involving such questions as that now before the Senate, for it was said that wages had to be lowered and that salaries had to be lowered to my beloved Southland because we were expected to continue to preserve a measure of penury and poverty. My God, Mr. President, when will all areas of this country be emancipated; when will they become wholly American, and when will we legislate for the Nation and not, with caution and with timid reserve, about certain areas and sections of the country that need most the strong arm of the Nation's assistance?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Florida,

I should like to ask him a question, which I know he can answer. On page 24 of committee print No. 2, there are set out the rates for interim placement benefits, and I notice this provision:

That these amounts shall be rounded upward to the nearest dollar, but shall not in any event exceed \$20 for an individual if he has no dependents, \$25 if he has one dependent, \$30 if he has two dependents, and \$35 if he has three or more dependents.

I understand that in order for one to get unemployment insurance he must have an earning capacity of at least 75 percent of the amount that will return him \$20 a week based upon the base period on which his wages are figured. I ask what happens to those who do not earn \$20 a week? I am speaking about the men and women who do not earn \$20 a week. Say they only earn \$12 a week, and have 12 children, what do they get?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the Senator that if he suggests there should be a minimum below which no one's compensation should fall I should heartily subscribe to it, and, if he could get his colleagues to go along with it, I am sure I could get the able Senator from Montana and the able Senator from West Virginia immediately to accept such an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not answer my question. Obviously the bill does not provide that they are to get any benefits for dependents if they earn, say, \$20 a week.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. What does it provide?

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator, if I may say so, is in error about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to be informed.

Mr. PEPPER. I have a table here to which I referred day before yesterday and which the Senator from Montana later put in the RECORD which sets forth the schedules. Let us take, for example, first a veteran.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was referring to civilians.

Mr. PEPPER. I am coming to the civilian later on, but, so as not to confuse the matter, I am referring to the veteran first. The veteran has a fixed compensation; he gets his \$20 a week if he has no dependents under the G. I. law, regardless of any previous income he may have had. Under the Murray-Kilgore bill he gets an additional \$5 a week for one dependent, \$10 a week for two dependents, and \$15 a week for three or more dependents. Those payments are made regardless of any compensation he may have received in the past. The civilian's compensation is related to the compensation he or she received in the base period, and, as all know, the base period is the highest quarter of compensation received by the worker in question in the course of the last 3 years. If the average weekly wage for the highest quarter received by the worker in the last 3 years is as much as \$48 a week and if the worker has no dependents he gets \$20 a week. If he has one dependent he gets \$25, two dependents \$30, and three dependents \$35. If, however, his weekly compensation for the base period is \$36 only and he has no dependents he gets

\$20, if he has one dependent \$25, two dependents \$27, and three dependents \$27. If his compensation in the base period were \$20 a week, with no dependents or with dependents, he would get only \$15 a week, because in cases where he would get less than \$48 a week he would receive only a maximum of 75 percent of the base wage received.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If he received only \$12 a week in the base period, under the Murray-Kilgore bill, whether he had dependents or not, he would get only \$9 a week. But I will ask the able Senator to make a comparison, in considering those lower figures, with what the same worker would get under the State laws. He would not get \$15 a week in Florida as compared with \$9. He would still get only a percentage of the \$12, which is vastly lower than what he would get under the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the explanation of the distinguished Senator from Florida, then this standard of living he discussed a moment ago which he said would be raised would be provided only for those who would come in the upper brackets, those receiving \$20 or \$25 or \$30 or \$35 a week. So that the Senator's answer to my question means, as I interpret it, that those in the lower brackets would not get nearly as much as those in the higher brackets.

Mr. PEPPER. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wanted to ascertain, how it would be possible to raise the standard of living under the bill, in view of the fact that the great mass of labor would fall below the bracket that would be taken care of in the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Mr. PEPPER. What I am afraid my able friend is overlooking is that the benefit to the worker in the low bracket would, under the Murray-Kilgore bill, be at least twice what he would get under the State compensation laws. So that if a comparison of the two is made, while the Murray-Kilgore bill is certainly not adequate, since it does not provide a minimum, it is vastly more adequate than would be the provision of the law with the George amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer is exactly what I thought it would be, and it confirms my belief that by the enactment of the Murray-Kilgore bill, instead of helping the masses of the people, we would be helping only the higher bracket workers of the country.

Mr. PEPPER. I dare say the able Senator would not want to put it just that way.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not want to put it that way, but that is as I understand it.

Mr. PEPPER. Since the bill does relate compensation benefits to compensation received by the worker, naturally it gives more to the man who received more than it gives to the man who received less. But what it does give to the worker in the lowest bracket is vastly more than he would get if the bill did not become law. The able Senator has done many progressive things, and if he will offer an amendment to fix a minimum of \$8 or \$10 or \$12 a week, I venture to

say I can speak for the sponsors of the bill and assure their immediate acceptance of his amendment, and certainly many of us who are advocates of the bill will gladly accept it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As the situation now exists, it would be impossible for us, by the proposed legislation, to raise the wages in the States where low wage scales are maintained.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no dispute with the Senator in his answer, but I maintain that his answer confirms my interpretation of what the proposal would result in if enacted, that it would not help the masses of the poor people, who need assistance, but it would give the benefits only to those who have high-bracket incomes.

Mr. PEPPER. No; the able Senator is not justified in that statement, if I may say so. This measure proposes more help and assistance to the unemployed workers of this country than any other bill pending before the Senate. Therefore, I favor it. If the able Senator says that the Murray-Kilgore amendment, although it provides more than would be available under the pending bill, does not provide enough, there are many of us who would agree with him, and I hope he will take the lead and propose an amendment making it more.

Mr. WALLGREN. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. Under the Murray-Kilgore bill, what happens in a case where a husband and wife have both been employed, and then have become unemployed?

Mr. PEPPER. I myself asked that question, and the answer I received was that under both the State system and under the pending bill both would get the compensation which goes to the individual worker. But obviously both husband and wife could not count the two children as the dependents of each. Only one of them would get the added compensation for having the dependents. If the wife were employed, she would not be counted as the dependent of the husband. So, in the case the able Senator puts, a case of husband and wife and two children, I venture to say the husband receiving \$48 a week in the base period would get \$20 for himself and \$5 a week for each of the two children, which would make \$30, and the wife would get \$30, if she made a minimum of \$48 a week.

Mr. WALLGREN. Would it make any difference how long they had been employed, as to whether they would be able to enjoy these benefits?

Mr. PEPPER. Not under the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case cited by the Senator from Washington, of a husband and wife who have both been at work during the war, perhaps due to their desire to do their patriotic duty, if

both should become unemployed after the war concluded, they would both have to accept employment if it were offered to them in order to entitle either of them to draw compensation, as I understand, either under the bill the Senator from Florida is discussing, or under the State system. They cannot deliberately avoid work and still draw compensation.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are many cases in which the wife has been working and is now working because of the war situation, and in which she would desire to return to her home and not be employed out of the home. She would, of course, not be entitled to draw unemployment compensation, because in that case she would have to accept employment if it were offered to her in order to draw compensation, or be unable to get employment. In other words, women who voluntarily go back into the home when the emergency is over, and desire to remain there, will not enjoy the compensation provided either under the State system or under the bill the Senator is discussing.

Mr. PEPPER. I am grateful to the Senator for pointing that out. Of course, the wife would have to take a job, just as a man would, if it were offered to her, and if it were a reasonable job, or she would be cut off from unemployment benefits.

Mr. WALLGREN. Does not the Senator think the bill would be improved if we should stipulate a certain length of time people must be employed before enjoying the benefits? For instance, a person may be employed for just a week, and then under this bill come in and receive all these benefits.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say "No" to my able friend from Washington, for this reason. What we are interested in as Members of Congress is twofold. First, we are interested in the welfare of the individual and, second, in the welfare of the Nation, or it can be put the other way if one chooses to do so. We know that if our economy goes into a depression spiral it will nearly ruin the country, as it did after the last war, and it will cost us tens if not hundreds of billions of dollars ever to reverse the spiral. If we let wages drop, if we let the national income suddenly precipitate downward, if we throw vast numbers of people out of employment, diminish their purchasing power, and break their morale and confidence, it will contribute to a downward slide in the national income.

Mr. WALLGREN. I am sympathetic with the bill and with what the Senator is trying to do, but he is taking as a base the wartime period.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WALLGREN. Today people are earning possibly two or three times more than they ever earned before in their lives. I am very anxious to go along with the Senator, but it seems to me the payments provided for are just a little too high.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Washington will realize that relatively few people will be in the \$48-a-week bracket, and, therefore, relatively few in-

dividuals, even if they have dependents, are going to receive \$20 or \$25 or \$30 or \$35 a week. As I said awhile ago, according to the latest figures I received from the Census Bureau, which are for 1939—we know that wages and salaries have increased since then, however—one-half of all the people in this country employed for wages or salaries received less than \$100 a month. That is less than \$25 a week, let alone \$48 a week. I suggest to the Senator that if he were to go to a shipyard and make a check he would find a relatively small number of the workers out of the whole number employed who are receiving as much as \$48 a week for a whole quarter. What I say does not refer to what is paid for 1 day or for 1 week, but the average which is paid for a whole quarter. An individual must have received \$48 a week for a whole quarter in order to entitle him to obtain \$20 a week if he has one dependent, and \$25 a week if he has two dependents. An individual must have received \$36 a week in the base period to entitle him to receive \$27 if he has a wife and two children. He must have been receiving \$20 a week during a whole quarter in the base period to entitle him to receive \$15 a week if he is without children.

In the State of Washington, for example, there are 569,000 covered workers, and the average weekly wage in that State is \$14.50. Workers who received only \$14.50 a week in the base period would receive but \$9 a week under the provisions of the pending measure. Does the Senator think that rate is too high to pay to a man in his State who has a wife and two children?

Mr. WALLGREN. I do not say it is too high; but I say the figure of the average wage is way off, according to my information.

Mr. PEPPER. I am guided by the report which the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] submitted to the Senate in connection with his bill. He received the figures from the Social Security Board, and I expect those figures are as accurate figures as we can obtain.

Mr. WALLGREN. Permit me to ask the Senator another question. Let us consider the situation with respect to the State of Washington. There has been a great migration of workers to our State from all over the country. They have moved from Georgia and from Alabama and from other States to the State of Washington. Under the provisions of the George bill is it not possible that those workers would be treated better in my State than they would in their own State?

Mr. PEPPER. Let us assume they are working in the State of Washington. In that State the maximum weekly benefit is \$15, and the maximum number of weeks of coverage is 16. The maximum weekly benefit in the State of the able Senator who sponsors the amendment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is \$18, as compared to \$15 in the State of Washington, and the period of coverage is the same.

Mr. WALLGREN. I think there is something wrong with those figures.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As the Senator knows, there were many individuals who were engaged in agricultural labor at the outbreak of the present emergency and the beginning of the war. They became industrial laborers in order to aid in the war effort. When the war is over and they are no longer engaged in industrial work, and there is no opportunity for them to continue that work, and they are offered work on the farm at the wages which prevail on the farm, which, as the Senator from Florida knows, are a great deal less than they received as industrial laborers, will they be entitled to obtain compensation under terms of the bill as industrial laborers, if they are unemployed?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President. Under the Murray-Kilgore bill, as I understand it, all workers will receive unemployment compensation based upon what they were receiving in the base period.

Mr. OVERTON. What effect will that have on the farm labor?

Mr. PEPPER. Let us consider a colored farm worker. What maximum wage would the Senator from Louisiana assume that he might have received for 3 continuous months at any time during the last 3 years? Is it likely that he received as much as \$20 a week?

Mr. OVERTON. It would hardly average that.

Mr. PEPPER. It would hardly average that. If he did not receive \$20 he would receive as unemployment compensation only \$9 a week. That is all he would receive.

Mr. OVERTON. But he was converted into an industrial laborer, and under the Murray-Kilgore bill his rate of pay for unemployment would be based on the highest wage he received as an industrial worker during the base period.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, but my understanding is that under the State law—

Mr. OVERTON. I am not talking about the State law. I am talking about the terms of the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the terms of that bill the compensation is geared to what the individual was doing during the base period, and, to answer the Senator's question, a farm worker who was converted into an industrial worker would be given pay on the industrial base for his unemployment compensation. But I point out to the Senator that it probably would not be so very high as to endanger the obtaining of farm labor.

Mr. OVERTON. It would be 75 percent of his base pay?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well. That would be far in excess of what he could receive on the farm, would it not?

Mr. PEPPER. It probably would be. I say, however—

Mr. OVERTON. What would such an individual do, unless he were a very patriotic man who said, "I will go back and work in order to keep the Nation fed and

in order to supply food for starving Europe, and so forth"? He could say, "I will receive more by not working."

Mr. PEPPER. No; I do not think anyone could successfully contend, I will say to my able friend, that that result would follow for two reasons. In the first place, as I have pointed out, such an individual would probably receive only \$9 a week unemployment compensation, and I suspect that even in peacetime he would get more than that on the farm.

But, Mr. President, putting that aside for the moment, the States would determine whether a job offered him is suitable for him to take in the period when he is unemployed. Undoubtedly one of the considerations which will guide the States in determining what job is suitable for such an individual is the question of the job the man had before he went into war work. So if he were a farm laborer, and a farm laborer's job at farm laborer's pay is tendered to him, and he declines to take it, he would lose the benefits which he would receive under the Murray-Kilgore measure.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator takes the position that such an individual cannot say, "I am now an industrial worker"?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I do not think so. There is nothing in the Murray-Kilgore bill which says that the States will have to honor such a claim even if he makes it.

Mr. OVERTON. The laborer will have to get employment of any kind for which he is suitable and qualified.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. And he would have to accept it?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. And if he did not accept it he would be disqualified?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. If he wants to appeal from the decision of the State board in cutting him off from unemployment compensation, then the procedure provided by the Murray-Kilgore bill is the same as he now has available to him under the Social Security Act. He could appeal to the Federal Work Administrator. The Administrator would refer the appeal to the Social Security Board, and the Social Security Board would determine the question. It would not be determined by a capricious administrator, by any single person, but the Social Security Board would determine whether or not the State agency acted properly in denying him his unemployment compensation because he refused to accept a job.

Mr. OVERTON. Let us consider a specific illustration. Let us take my own State, the city of New Orleans, where the Higgins industries are located, as well as a great many other war industries. Let us say that a man has been working there for 18 months or 2 years or 3 years. He originally came from the farm. He is living now in the city of New Orleans. He knocks at the factory door of the Higgins industries and is told, "We have no need for you any longer. Make a claim for unemployment compensation." What is to happen to him? He now lives in the city of New Orleans. Is he entitled to unemployment compensation? Or can he be told, "We have looked up your back history. We find

that at one time you worked on a farm. Leave New Orleans and find work on a farm. If you do not do so you will not be entitled to unemployment compensation."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, criticism was made of the Murray-Kilgore bill because it gave too much authority to the Work Administrator to move people around the country. It was said he could capriciously send one man out to California and one up to Washington, and so forth and so on. The able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] in answer to that complaint placed in the bill a provision that the Federal Work Administrator could not deny an individual his unemployment benefits simply because he did not accept the transportation which was tendered to him. So I could not say that the Work Administrator would have authority to order the man to go back to the farm.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think it is a question of transportation. The man is in the city of New Orleans. He has been an industrial worker for a number of years, but it is determined that he could work on the farm. He is told that he must go back to the farm. He is not transported back to the farm. It is a voluntary act on his part. He can remain in New Orleans if he so desires, but if he does, he will not receive any compensation.

Mr. PEPPER. Except for certain general standards, the bill leaves that discretion to the State agency which administers the law. The State agency will be expected to work out the problem and administer the law in a practical way.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator will agree with me that a very serious question is presented, so far as farm labor is concerned, not only in the South, but throughout the Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. The State agency would have the right to make the decision under the State law. The same question might arise under the State law. The State agency would have to make the decision. As I understand, there is nothing in this bill which would prevent the State agency from making the same decision in that matter that it might make under the State law were it not for the Federal act.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks. I have said that whether the Senate should adopt titles I and II of the Murray-Kilgore bill, or titles I and II of the George amendment, is relatively immaterial. But, Mr. President, the George amendment is whole. It is not a divided amendment; and title III of the George amendment and title III of the Murray-Kilgore amendment are as far apart as the poles. The Murray-Kilgore amendment allows to the war worker up to 6 months' retraining opportunity, at the expense of the Federal Government. It gives added mustering-out pay to the veteran. It gives up to \$15 a month added compensation to the dependents of a veteran, and it vastly increases the amount of unemployment compensation which an unemployed war worker might enjoy in the period of transition and pos-

sible unemployment. None of these benefits are provided by the George amendment.

I asked the Library of Congress to give me what figures they could as to what the last depression cost this country. I hear able Senators of the opposition point of view speak of the economy of the George proposal. I wish to suggest how much the last depression cost this country. The figures given me by the Library of Congress show that the private investment loss due to the depression was \$74,600,000,000. That was the business loss in respect to investments which this country sustained in the period from 1930 to 1939. The loss in 1930 was \$3,400,000,000; in 1931, \$7,000,000,000; in 1932, \$10,500,000,000; in 1933, \$11,000,000,000; in 1934, \$10,100,000,000; and so forth. The loss in investments during that depression was nearly \$75,000,000,000. The Government in power did not have the vision or the courage to prevent that depression.

But, Mr. President, that is not the greatest loss which we sustained. The figures show that the consumption deficiency in this country in the period from 1930 to 1939 amounted to \$145,900,000,000. In other words, the folly of the Government cost this Nation almost as much as the tragedy of this war cost.

God knows, we did everything we could to prevent this war. The question now is, Are we going to do everything we can to prevent the curse of another depression? Senators who talk about economy being practiced by the Government when we condemn to poverty and starvation the masses of the people of the country simply do not appreciate the economic significance of what they say. During the last depression there was a consumption deficiency of \$145,900,000,000. That was the reason why business lost its profits. That was the reason why investors lost their returns and stockholders lost their dividends. The masses of America's people could not buy.

Has there ever been a more eloquent illustration of what makes a country prosperous than we have experienced during this war? It is not the profits of the corporations. It is not the large fees of professional men. It is the purchasing power of a Nation at work which has made this Nation prosperous during this war. That is the recipe for prosperity in every age and under every government.

The converse is also true. If we permit these men and women to leave the war plants and go home to unemployment, the spiral of purchasing power will fall. Every merchant will keep his goods on his shelves, and begin to discharge his clerks, thus adding more unemployment. The banks will not receive the interest on their loans; the sawmills will stop cutting lumber for houses; quarries will close; and we shall have bread lines, and perhaps at last another W. P. A. as the only hope for America's people.

That is what we are facing. We have an opportunity not only to do justice to America's people, but to assure prosperity to this Nation. As I indicated in my

question a moment ago directed to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], with a large fixed debt such as we must carry, if we do not keep the national income in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000,000, we shall be ruined. Yet we cannot do that by a niggardly policy of false economy. We have seen the results of false economy in what it has cost the Nation in illness because we would not assure the health of the Nation. We have seen the results of false economy following our failure to educate the boys and girls of this Nation and train them for productive work.

There are some who would condemn the unemployed to compensation of \$15 a week. It is said that that is enough for them, and that it is all we can afford. Mr. President, on the contrary, we cannot afford to let them have a purchasing power of only \$15 a week as a maximum. If we were to think only in terms of dollars and cents, savings, and good business investment; if we were to think only of ourselves, and not of the unemployed; if we were to think only of the banks and large corporations, all we would have to do to make them prosperous would be to say to the masses of America's millions, "You will not be condemned to a standard of living which is indecent for an American."

That is the decision which we are to make, Mr. President. The national income has steadily risen. Beginning in 1929 it was \$83,000,000,000. In 1930 it dropped to \$68,000,000,000. In 1930—the mention of that year arouses memories, Mr. President—a President and a Congress said, "No; it would be a violation of States' rights, and would be improper for the Federal Government to step in and save the Nation from wreck and ruin." We stood by, Mr. President, and that President and that Government tried to do what Pontius Pilate did a long time ago when faced with a decision with respect to which he ought to have taken responsibility. He washed his hands and turned Christ over to the rabble to be crucified. The Government of the United States followed a similar course. Like a modern Pontius Pilate it tried to wash its hands of responsibility for the lives of America's millions, and turn them over to be crucified upon the cross of a ruthless and heartless economic depression.

Mr. President, if this Government has the courage, if we have the vision, if we have the will, and if we have the human heart and sympathy required, we can make this mighty land to which these men will return a veritable Garden of Eden.

We can make it a land of happy families and good homes; we can make it a land of education and health; we can make it a land of recreation and culture. We can make it, Mr. President, the envy of all the ages, the nearest to the human aspirations for paradise which can be achieved upon the footstool of mortal man.

So, Mr. President, I think we make a very significant decision when we vote on these amendments. I trust that the

decision we make may be one of which we may be proud in the years which lie ahead.

During the course of Mr. PEPPER's remarks,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks an article published in the Washington Post of today, entitled "Reconversion Expert From W. P. B. Linked to C. I. O. Unit"?

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the article may be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida.

The article is as follows:

RECONVERSION EXPERT FROM W. P. B. LINKED TO C. I. O. UNIT—PRESENCE OF MURRAY BILL "MASTER MIND" ON SENATE FLOOR SETS OFF "RUCKUS"

(By Mary Spargo)

An \$8,000-a-year War Production Board expert, who was reported to be in close communication with Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, was portrayed yesterday as the master mind behind the Murray-Kilgore-Truman reconversion bill.

The expert, Dr. Herbert Schimmel of 3604 Minnesota Avenue SE., who claimed he wrote the measure which would establish sweeping controls over American labor and industry, is acting chief clerk of the Kilgore War Mobilization Subcommittee, on loan from W. P. B.

START OF "RUCKUS"

What Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY (Democrat, Kentucky) described as the "ruckus" in the Senate started when Schimmel, acting for Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, Montana), whispered to the Presiding Officer during the afternoon session.

Immediately the minority whip, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) jumped up and challenged the Presiding Officer, Senator JOHN H. OVERTON (Democrat, Louisiana).

None but secretaries to Senators and committee clerks on the Senate pay roll are allowed floor privileges under Senate rules.

TELEPHONE CALLS CITED

Schimmel's close contact with the Political Action Committee was established in the record of long-distance telephone slips between the P. A. C. New York office and Washington, recently seized by the House committee investigating un-American activities.

Eight of the person-to-person calls, according to the record, were to Schimmel, and there were said to be many others, station to station, to his extension in the Senate Office Building.

Schimmel, who talked to the press in the presence of Kilgore, said that most of the calls were between him and former members of the Kilgore committee staff now employed by P. A. C.

These two former Kilgore staff members, the Senator said, are Palmer Webber and Malcolm Hobbs, who were also loaned him from a downtown department.

COUNCIL FOR C. I. O. CHIEF

Questioned about a third staff member, Dr. Robert K. Lamb, Kilgore said he is now a legislative counsel for Philip Murray, C. I. O. chieftain.

Kilgore and Schimmel denied that P. A. C. calls were any different from any other calls

received in the committee office. KILGORE said if anyone subpoenaed the records of the National Association of Manufacturers or the Chamber of Commerce he would find similar calls to his subcommittee.

The C. I. O. which established the political action committee to work for a fourth term for President Roosevelt, has, however, been the loudest voice raised in support of the bill which had the approval of Senators MURRAY, KILGORE, and TRUMAN, the latter now Vice-Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party.

In response to questions, Schimmel said he had served as chief of the investigations and hearings staff of the Kilgore subcommittee when a report on war shipping was issued. He said he supervised the report.

This report was denounced some time ago by the West Coast Sailor, official publication of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, as "a new mission from Moscow."

"The report itself," the official organ of the union (A. F. of L.) said, "could have been drawn up and submitted by any Communist Party front, so faithfully does it perform the functions of the Communist Party."

KILGORE and Schimmel said the report had improved the shipping situation.

The sharp interchange over what Schimmel was doing whispering to the presiding officer, came during the middle of a speech by Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB (Republican, West Virginia). REVERCOMB was denouncing the bill as a national service act for the unemployed.

Disclosure of the political action committee connection with the Murray-Kilgore-Truman measure reminded Capitol observers of a situation some years ago when scandal arose over the part Joe Grundy, spokesman for Pennsylvania industrial interests, was playing in connection with high tariff legislation.

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN (Democrat, Missouri), told reporters yesterday he hoped for unanimous action Monday on a reconversion bill, but there was every evidence yesterday that the conservative forces led by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE (Democrat, Georgia), would press for action on the George bill and refuse any compromise.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	Revercomb
Andrews	Gurney	Reynolds
Austin	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scruggam
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Green	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE IN THE MAKING OF TREATIES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have observed with a great deal of satisfaction the patriotic manner in which the Members of Congress have responded to the call of American public opinion, forgetting, as it were, their partisan interest. We are here assembled in the midst of what may be for the American commonwealth a crucial electoral campaign, in the midst of a world-wide conflagration, and, if we wish to carry it further, we could say in the midst of the decisive moments of that struggle in which the destinies of nations, ideologies, and races are at stake.

The Nation should feel gratified with the promptness and alertness with which its legislators have responded to the all-significant developments of recent days on the war fronts, whether in Russia, Italy, Normandy, Guam, or other strategic areas. The recent magnificent victories are made more dramatic by the heroism and valor of our sons and daughters, and those events have made us at home realize the need for economic reorientation in the wake of successful military developments. We have answered by returning to the Nation's Capital to find ways and means of providing for the foreseeable end of this World War and to prepare for the difficult problems of reconversion.

The legislative wheels are turning and democracy will once again show to the world its creative and energetic ways. The Senate of the United States is leading in this respect, and be it to its credit that the world is converging its collective eyes on the methodical and efficient manner in which we are dealing with such a transcendental problem.

In glowing terms which reach the superlative, and not without justification, historians and political scientists refer to the United States Senate as the greatest legislative body since the peak days of Roman history. We in our deliberations affect a greater world than the Romans ever dreamed of, and with the facilities of modern communications our acts and our deeds are communicable to the entire world with more rapidity than the Roman populace could have known of what was going on in the Roman Senate. In other words, the world is our public, and conversely the world shall judge us.

This is the principal reason why at this critical moment in human history the Senate of the United States should stop for a moment of self-analysis.

Why do I say this? Why, at the very moment when we are attempting to cope with the stupendous problems of reconversion and peacetime problems of unemployment, do I take the floor in this august body to ask for this analysis?

Precisely so that we may justify the hope which the world has reposed in us. Yes; it is time for us to pause and think. It is time for us to weigh our responsibilities as carefully as the scientist measures his materials with his most accurate instrument; and this not only in the light of present-day developments but in the light of our historical emergence as a legislative body.

It is time that we should pause and conscientiously consider the mistakes we have made in the past. We should not be ashamed of having been human, and thus of having fallen into the pitfalls of error. We are not infallible, nor are we supposed to be, for error is common to all human activity.

I am not trying to be professorial nor erudite. I am simply making an effort to be very practical and very matter of fact. I refer to the legislation which we are now attempting to consider and to pass upon. I say in all earnestness that reconversion and all its ramifications are all well and good. This has to do with our domestic front. But are we going to stop there? How about the counterpart, the foreign front? By this I mean our foreign relations. Is the Senate of the United States today thinking and planning adequately to discharge its duties fully and to use its constitutional prerogatives in the fullest meaning of those prerogatives for the welfare of humanity at large? Let the reaction to my remarks suffice for an answer.

It is not untimely for us to examine into the genesis of this body, of its duties, responsibilities, and prerogatives, taken both by themselves and the interrelation they bear with the executive duties, responsibilities, and prerogatives. It is time for us to reexamine the origin of the provisions in our constitutional charter, and to see for ourselves if we have adhered to them or whether we have allowed them to be nullified by time and the attitudes of our statesmen. It is time for us to consider whether it has been wise to depart from the purposes and ideals of the founding fathers. It is the hour for us to consider what has happened to us as a result of such departure.

Let us look at the record.

The Constitution of the United States provides in very simple, yet very definite, terms for the President, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

As time and experience have shown, the founders of the Republic knew well the fundamentals of government, perhaps because they were rich in political experience and possessed a deep understanding of the human elements which seep into the science of government. They knew the meaning of words, and they did not waste time in redundancy or useless repetitions. Able grammarians were among them, and the historical document over which they labored to the breaking point of human endurance is the best evidence of their exactness. Their every word was later on to be scrutinized by scientists, scholars, jurists, and statesmen, not only at home but in every commonwealth thereafter created under the sun.

The history of the relations of the United States with foreign nations has shown that the Senate of the United States has not only carefully complied with its duties, and valiantly defended its rights and prerogatives so far as the consent part of the previously quoted constitutional provision is concerned, but it has been alert in not

allowing the executive branch of the Government to encroach upon such prerogative. Perhaps the only exception is in the case of so-called executive agreements, about one of which we read in the newspapers 2 or 3 days ago, relating to the agreement between England and the United States with reference to petroleum. Can we, however, say as much with regard to the advice part of the same provision of the Constitution?

Before we answer this question let us look further at the record, so that we may know the extent of the meaning of the words used by our founding fathers.

After the Constitution was framed, and while it was in the process of ratification by the several States, the framers were busy explaining it to the peoples of those States. What they said at that time has a decided bearing upon the meaning of those laconic but far-reaching provisions. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay took upon themselves the task of carrying their explanations to the people of New York so that they could realize the implications and meaning of the provisions of the proposed Constitution. Published contemporaneously in newspapers, and later compiled and published as a constitutional treatise, those commentaries have become one of the principal sources of information for the citizen, student, and statesman.

Hamilton discussed the treaty-making power in an article which he published in the *Independent Journal*, and which is known as No. 75.

This feature of the Constitution was termed by him one of the best-digested by the constitutional assembly. After considering the practice in the Old World under the monarchical system of government, where princes considered the treaty-making power a part of their heavenly granted prerogatives, Hamilton considered the different views of the framers and their conclusions regarding the American repository of that all-important function of government.

In spite of the fact that the whole frame of the Constitution was built upon the segregation of three supreme powers and the avoidance of an intermixture of powers, when the Constitution makers came to the treaty-making power they decided to lodge it in the twilight zone whereon converged a part of the functions of the executive and a part of the functions of the legislative. Further considerations impelled them to limit it to only one of the two branches of the National Legislature, to wit, the Senate, perhaps the most important consideration being its smaller membership in comparison to that of the House of Representatives.

While some of the critics of the times then advanced the suggestion that this power should have been lodged in the Presidency exclusively, others were of the opinion that the Senate should deal exclusively with it. The arguments in favor of the exclusiveness of the Executive were based upon the secrecy and immediate dispatch sometimes requisite in the negotiation of treaties. Incidentally, Jay discussed these aspects thoroughly in his article numbered 64, which was pub-

lished in the New York Packet on March 7, 1788.

When Hamilton was discussing the exclusion of the House of Representatives from the participation in the treaty-making power, he used the following important words:

The greater frequency of the calls upon the House of Representatives, and the greater length of time which it would often be necessary to keep them together when convened, to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty, would be a source of so great inconvenience and expense as alone ought to condemn the project.

Hamilton used words which are worth repeating: "to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty." They are very significant because here he states what the drafters of the Constitution had in mind; namely, the progressive stages in the negotiation of a treaty, which is what the word "advice" implies.

What did Hamilton have in mind? These words are clear enough. The progressive stages of a treaty are not those appearing after the negotiations have been completed, and after all that remains to be obtained is the "consent" of the Senate and the formality of the exchange of ratifications. He was referring to the stages of negotiation, from the very inception of diplomatic contacts, exchange of views, and discussion of the terms.

This is still more evident when we recall that while discussing this topic, Hamilton had in mind the previous article written by his collaborator Jay. Hamilton then said:

As I flatter myself the observations made in a preceding number upon this part of the plan [these observations] must have sufficed to place it, to a discerning eye, in a favorable light.

What was he referring to? To Jay's article numbered 64, above quoted, in which he discussed the treaty-making power, and Hamilton was, in his own words, "offering only some supplementary remarks."

In the light of experience we are apt to ask ourselves if we have departed from the intention of the framers of the Constitution? We are constrained to answer in the affirmative. As time passes, the executive branch of the Government has become more and more exclusive in this respect, to such an extent that it culminated in the now historical events leading to the negotiation of the Treaty of Versailles, and subsequently to the rejection by this body of that treaty, and the consequent disillusion of the whole world in the wake of the nonattainment of the high purposes and ideals which motivated such negotiations.

We do not wish, of course, to enter into the sphere of speculation, and it would serve no good purpose to cry over what might have been; but of one thing we can be certain, and that is that had the so-called "irreconcilables" of the Senate been asked to give their advice through the constitutional vehicle of which we are speaking the results might have been different. Much has been said recently about the mistakes of those

statesmen, some of whom are gone and cannot defend themselves, and it would not be fair to attack them now; but retrospection is the order of the day, and, so far as it may be constructive and illustrative, we can with all candor point to what happened as a good example of what we may avoid in the future. Yes, we can avoid mistakes of this nature by adhering to the letter and to the spirit of our National Constitution.

If there be those who do not like the terms or provisions which lodge the treaty-making power in the Senate jointly with the President—and by this I mean the treaty-making power in all its progressive stages—let them proceed to amend the Constitution in the manner provided by the Constitution itself. Why should the executive branch of the Government arrogate to itself exclusively powers which constitutionally belong to the two branches? Is custom, I ask, sufficient to obliterate from that charter the rights and prerogatives granted by the Constitution? I venture to throw my lot with the negative. It is only for the Senate to assert its rights and prerogatives, and here and now I challenge my colleagues to stand up and remedy a dangerous situation in our national life.

The time is ripe for the rectification of our course. Let us take to the right course, a course from which we have certainly deviated. Let us rise and comply with our constitutional duties. Let us no longer allow the Executive to infringe upon our constitutional mandate and assume our obligations in the most chaotic moments of a world crisis.

By doing this not only will we maintain and support our Constitution, but we will thereby bring the prestige of the Senate to the high level it ought to enjoy in our governmental structure, and what is more significant, we will inspire in other nations and their governments a firmer hope that whatever is negotiated with the American commonwealth will have a better chance of crystallization than heretofore.

We owe it to our comrades in arms, to our Chief Executive, to ourselves, and to our allies to follow the course I have suggested.

It is indeed disturbing to observe how the part the Senate is called upon to play in treaty making diminishes step by step, while the part played by the executive branch increases. Under the expediency of executive agreements, which need not be submitted to the Congress, the latter part of the constitutional provision of "advice and consent" is obviated, circumvented, avoided. How far is this to go? Is it to be allowed? We grant that with proper safeguards this kind of treaty making may be advantageous. Nevertheless, it is high time that the Senate itself determine to what extent it will permit the collaborator to act by himself. A definite policy should be adopted and adhered to. Why? Because by the terms of the Constitution a treaty entered into by the United States becomes the supreme law of the land. We do not have to stretch our imagination to realize that such a treaty, nego-

tiated exclusively by the Executive, may nullify completely legislation constitutionally enacted by the national Congress, and even by the legislatures of the several States. This point really affords food for thought.

In the progress of human relations candidness and fair dealing are of the essence. We cannot afford another experience such as that suffered in the case of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations Covenant. Let us set a good example to those we urge to emulate us.

The thinkers of the times have their eyes focused on us. In the words of Hugh Gibson, "There is general recognition today that there is something unsatisfactory in the relations between the Senate and the Executive and that something should be done about it." Mr. Gibson is right and so are many others who are bringing this question to the attention of the American people.

My suggestion is simple and to the point. The Senate should adopt a resolution advising the Executive of its intention and determination to assert its constitutional prerogatives from this day on. The battle cry will be there, and I wonder if there is any soul daring enough to go against the constitutional mandate and the will of the Senate, which in this instance is the historical will of the American people.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on August 8 I had printed an amendment which I intended to propose to the bill. The amendment provides against discrimination on racial or other grounds. In view of the parliamentary situation, I cannot offer it to the pending George amendment, but I wonder if the Senator from Montana will accept it as a modification of his amendment. The amendment, to be inserted at the proper place, is as follows:

On page 10, after line 11, add a new section 104, as follows:

"Sec. . . . In the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or sex."

On page 17, line 19, after the words "Navy Department," add: "President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice".

On page 29, line 16, after the word "claims" add: "without discrimination on account of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or sex".

On page 40, line 11, after the words "Puerto Rico," add: "and all other possessions of the United States".

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment just proposed by the Senator from New Mexico is a proper and valuable amendment, and I wish to accept it.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	Revercomb
Andrews	Gurney	Reynolds
Austin	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scruggam
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Green	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the gravity of the situation which would exist in this country should the war in Europe end suddenly. I appreciate the need for making provision for such contingency with the least possible delay. I realize that the Senate has been called back into session for the purpose of enacting legislation which will better prepare our country for the ending of hostilities in Europe.

We are now considering two bills, and various amendments offered to those bills. These bills were not printed until a few days ago, and very few of the Members of the Senate had any opportunity to see them until this week. Some of us were on the way back to Washington and could not possibly get a chance to read the bills until Tuesday morning. During the last few days, making use of whatever opportunity I was afforded, I have devoted myself to reading and considering the two measures proposed to be enacted. I have not been able to keep up with the various amendments as they have been proposed, and I have not been able to give the bills the consideration which I feel I would have to give them before I could vote upon them intelligently. Yet from reading the bills and listening to the discussions on this floor, I can only conclude that neither bill anywhere near meets the situation which confronts this country today or deals fairly with all groups of Americans alike.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the enactment of either one of these bills in its present form could prove satisfactory and beneficial only to minority elements of our country. I cannot find a line in either bill that would prevent unemployment or create any new employment. They are both devoted to the payment of unemployment compensation and the means through which such payments should be made.

I cannot find in either bill the slightest provision sympathetic to the millions of poor people in our country who have lived in near distress conditions throughout the entire war and whose conditions will be aggravated with the ending of the war.

I can find in neither bill any provision offering more than scant sympathy to the low-paid white-collar workers of the country, and I can find in neither bill any mention of that great group upon whom the blow would fall hardest should the war end suddenly and the purchasing power of the American public be drastically reduced—the American farmer.

American agriculture would be the first to feel acute suffering from a drastic lowering of living standards and purchasing power of industrial workers. American agriculture may face, indeed will face, disastrous surpluses and collapsing prices at the end of hostilities unless we make preparations to meet such a condition.

I ask Senators to consider just one agricultural commodity, and that is milk. In June 1940 the farmers of the United States produced 11,641,000,000 pounds of milk, for which they received an average of \$1.63 a hundred pounds, or about 3½ cents a quart delivered to market. That was a low price, in most cases an unprofitable price.

When war came on much milk was needed for the armed forces. Our industrial workers also demanded more milk. They had the money to pay for it. They bought all the milk previously sold as fluid milk and a large part of that which had previously been manufactured into butter, cheese, and other byproducts. The Government sought by every means to increase the production of milk in America. However, such an increase cannot be obtained over night as it takes 3 years to produce a dairy cow.

By June 1944, however, the production of milk in the United States had increased to 12,540,000,000 pounds, or about 1,000,000,000 pounds more for the same month in 1944 than in 1940. The average price received by dairymen for June 1944, for the whole United States, was \$3.11 per hundred pounds, or 6½ cents a quart, plus a subsidy which varied from 35 to 65 cents a hundred pounds, depending upon the locality in which it was produced.

This increase in price of milk from \$1.63 a hundred in 1940 to \$3.11 a hundred, plus a subsidy of 35 cents to 65 cents in 1944, has been brought about almost solely through the increase in purchasing power of American industrial workers.

Cows and heifers 2 years and older in milk production have increased from 24,926,000 on January 1, 1940, to 27,607,000 on January 1, 1944. Heifers 1 year and older have increased from 5,521,000 on January 1, 1940, to 6,222,000 on January 1, 1944. Heifers 1 year and under have increased from 5,965,000 on January 1, 1940, to 7,039,000 on January 1, 1944. Over the 4-year period, this represents an increase in cows and heifers of several million, and the increase was brought about at the request of our Government, which asked for an increase in milk production, just as it asked the industrialist to increase the output of his factory and of the laborer to put in more hours of work.

In June 1940 a production of 11,641,000,000 pounds of milk constituted a surplus of milk, so that the farmer averaged only \$1.63 a hundred pounds for it.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator tell us how much that is a quart?

Mr. AIKEN. That is 3½ cents a quart, but that price is the price delivered to the market, and there is considerable transportation expense to come out of it. The farmer probably realized only 3 cents a quart for his milk at that time.

Mr. President, cannot everyone see what would happen to the dairy industry in America if the present production of 12,540,000,000 pounds should find itself without a market because people could not buy it, and there was no demand for it from the armed services? Yet we are making no preparation whatsoever, we are not planning anything to take care of a situation such as, if we stopped to think of it, we would know must exist at the end of the hostilities in Europe.

The American farmers have increased their output of milk at the constant urging of their Government. They do not deserve any such calamity to be visited upon them as would certainly occur if the industrial pay roll of America should be reduced to the pre-war purchasing level, and no provision whatsoever was made to take care of the tremendous loss which American agriculture would sustain as the result of complying with the urgent request of its Government.

Milk is only one item. What applies to milk applies also to fruit, to the fiber crops, and to other agricultural products. I ask, Mr. President, are not American farmers deserving citizens of their country? Do they not deserve consideration in post-war planning? Should not they, as well as industry and labor, be protected against distress? Why is it we are called upon to legislate for industry and to protect the manufacturer from loss while the plight of agriculture goes ignored?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The beef and cattle industry and the hog industry are in a very precarious condition, as well as the milk industry. So far as I know, no provision is made in the pending legislation to take care of those industries if a sudden slump should come upon us as it did after the last war. At that time there was an artificial deflation of agriculture. So far as we know, the same thing may occur again unless protective legislation is enacted to prevent an artificial slump. After the last war, in the year 1920, when we had the greatest surplus of food in our history, the banks were ordered by the Federal Reserve Board to liquidate all agricultural loans. At that time we had more wheat and more pork than at any other time in the Nation's history, but an artificial slump was brought about, the market was broken by the calling of agricultural loans by the banks.

There should be enacted an omnibus bill to take care of all these contingencies and place all American citizens in the same boat, and give them all the same

protection. We are legislating today as though only labor were involved. Industry is taken care of through contracts made with it. I am glad the Senator from Vermont mentioned the possibility of a precarious condition existing with respect to the farmer, who ought to have safeguards provided for him similar to the safeguards provided for other branches of our productive capacity. Farmers work from 14 to 18 hours a day and have produced surpluses at the request of the Government. What is going to happen to them? It seems to me that a comprehensive over-all program ought to be worked out carefully in committee. There is time to do it, and I think it ought to be done. This is piecemeal legislation. If the proposed legislation is enacted, we do not know what protection will be given to other elements of our economy.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks. I think he views the situation clearly as regards the post-war dangers to agriculture. I believe that everyone of us should realize that we cannot legislate for industry or labor alone, but that industry, labor, and agriculture are all interdependent, and if one is left unprotected and goes down, the others will absolutely have to go down with it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the Price Control Act, or some other act, we enacted a provision which guarantees the prices of the five basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. Loans may be made at 90 percent of parity for 3 years, as I remember, after the war. So it cannot be said that the farmer is left entirely uncared for. After all his interest is in the price of his products. We may not have covered the entire picture; but, so far as the five basic commodities are concerned, as I understand, we are guaranteeing today, and for at least 3 years after the war, a minimum of 90 percent of parity.

Mr. AIKEN. Those are the five basic commodities.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. However, products of greater value than the five basic commodities include beef, milk, poultry, and other agricultural items.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Also sheep and hogs.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Furthermore, in the confusion which we fear is likely to result, all the economists in the Government cannot keep parity figured up to date. The farmers know from experience that they usually get the short end of things.

We are asked to protect labor against the disastrous lowering of wage and living standards; and yet no mention is made of American farmers in either of the bills which the Senate has under consideration. Is it because the farmers do not deserve the consideration which industry and labor deserve? Is it because they have not supported the war effort? If my information is correct, no group in America has more faithfully

and loyally devoted itself to the winning of the war than have the American farmers; and yet so far not a voice has been raised in consideration of the farmer, and the plight in which he will find himself at the end of the war, with a reduced demand for his products and a tremendous surplus on hand.

Mr. President, I believe that the failure to take the farmers into consideration is probably due to an oversight, or because other groups have been more insistent in their demands that they be protected against possible calamity at the end of the war. I am in favor of protecting American industry against disaster during the reconversion period. I am equally in favor of protecting labor against the disastrous lowering of income levels and living standards. I agree with many of the provisions of the bills introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for the protection of labor during the period immediately following the war. But I see in those bills elements of grave danger unless they are properly safeguarded and amended. I cannot support either of them as it is now written, nor can I vote to return millions of American industrial workers to pre-war unemployment conditions which might force them to accept employment at wages so low that they could not decently support their families, and which might conceivably impair our national health and safety.

Since my return to Washington I have heard it argued that we should get back to a pre-war economy at the earliest possible date after the conclusion of the war. I emphatically disagree with the state of mind which prompts any man to urge that we return to a pre-war economy and a pre-war income level. The very fact that our national debt has increased from \$44,000,000,000 in July 1940, to more than \$199,000,000,000 on July 1, 1944, or fivefold, should be conclusive evidence to anyone that we cannot return to pre-war economy and pre-war income. Our national income must be held up if the country is to be kept on a safe financial footing.

We legislate for the future, and not the past. If our legislation does not make the future better than the past, we should not undertake to legislate at all. If millions of industrial workers are sent home to seek other jobs, and other millions of people who were only employed part-time before the war are thrown out of work, they will be forced to seek employment at whatever wage they can get. That means that servants can be again hired to set tables, to brush clothes, and drive cars, and they can probably be hired at wages a great deal less than they are now receiving. It will mean that we can hire employees for other purposes, to do things which probably ought to be done, but which we have had to do without during the war. But if millions of men are forced to go back to work at too low levels of wages, it will also mean poorer diets for millions, poorer health, poorer teeth, poorer eyesight for children, poorer education, and poorer standards in many

other respects that we in America should never tolerate. It will mean that more people will not have new bathrooms, electric lights, or even food, and consequently that manufacturers will not be able to sell all they produce.

We do not want the old pre-war economy back. We want to work for the future. As I stated in the beginning, I do not minimize the necessity of enacting at the very earliest possible date legislation to take care of post-war situations; but I am resentful when I think that I am expected to vote on what many of my colleagues say is the most important question of this generation, after having had the bill in my hands for only 3 days, with little opportunity to study it.

While it is desirable to enact some legislation as soon as possible, we must not hurry through undesirable legislation merely to enable us to say that we have enacted some legislation to take care of the situation, because such legislation would be full of errors which would have to be corrected later, and which would perhaps cause considerable damage before they were corrected.

I cannot vote for either bill now before the Senate as it is at present written. I believe that a bill can be written which would be fair to all groups, and which would take care of the situation for agriculture as well as for industry and labor. For that reason I move that the two bills now under consideration be recommitted to the respective committees from which they were reported, so that those committees may bring forth a real American plan which will be fair to all groups in our Nation, and which the Congress can safely approve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentarian informs the present occupant of the chair that there is but one bill now before the Senate. That is Senate bill 2051. The other bill is involved because it is presented by way of amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I move that whichever bill is properly before the Senate be now recommitted to the committee from which it was reported.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator has in mind the writing of a new omnibus bill to take into consideration the needs of all the various branches of our economy, would it not be well to have just one committee do that? I think the Senator said the bill should be referred to various committees. But now there is only one bill. What committee handled the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the bill which is properly before the Senate is the one which was reported by the Finance Committee. I ask the Chair whether that is correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It appears to me that somewhere between the two bills we are considering lies a fair answer to the problem.

I also hope that consideration will be given to our great agricultural population, for if that goes down it will inevitably carry down with it labor and industry.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I merely rise to state that I concur heartily in and endorse the sentiments expressed by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I say that, after watching him in action since his coming to the Senate, the profession of agriculture has no more ardent or sincere supporter. I shall gladly support his motion to recommit the bill, in accordance with his remarks and his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that Senate bill 2051 be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make only one observation. The Committee on Finance has no jurisdiction of any of the problems to which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] referred in his address. It has no jurisdiction over the farm problem as such, or over the cancellation of war contracts, or over the reconversion of war industries to peacetime. If the bill were recommitted to the Committee on Finance, such action would properly apply only to that provision of the bill which deals directly and exclusively with the amendment of the Social Security Act. Therefore I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the motion I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he amend his motion so as to request the appointment of a select committee, and to have on that committee various members of the committees which have charge of the different subjects. I suggest that such a special committee be appointed and that the bill be referred to it. On that committee I would have members appointed from the Committee on Military Affairs, the Finance Committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I correctly understand that if the motion to recommit Senate bill 2051 is agreed to, Senate bill 2061 will still be before the Senate for consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will still be on the calendar, but will not be the pending business.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, regardless of whether the Finance Committee would have anything to do with the agricultural situation, personally I do not see how I can vote for Senate bill 2051, having to do with unemployment compensation, as it is now before us, having been reported from the Finance Committee. But I believe that for the good of the country we should consider the matter of the post-war treatment of agriculture, labor, and industry, all at practi-

cally one and the same time, and that if the Finance Committee does not have anything pertaining to agriculture under its jurisdiction—and I accept the word of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that it does not—the proper committee should report a bill to the Senate. I believe that if we go ahead and legislate for the benefit of industry and labor, but leave agriculture until the end, agriculture is likely to receive far less consideration than it would receive if it could be considered at approximately the same time when the other industries are considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Vermont withdraws his motion to recommit the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I do not. I do not think we should legislate for one or two groups, and leave out the other group.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that Senate bill 2051 be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of today. The editorial is entitled "Time to Compromise." It expresses my views on the pending legislation much more convincingly and ably than I could possibly present them. I am very much concerned over the prospect that in voting on this legislation I may have to choose the lesser of two evils. I find one proposal wholly inadequate and the other demoralizingly lavish, to borrow a phrase from the Post editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO COMPROMISE

The Senate debate over the unemployment compensation features of the rival George and Kilgore demobilization bills has revealed the serious inadequacies of the former, even in its modified form, and the demoralizing lavishness of the latter. Both bills set up Federal supervisory machinery to cooperate with the States in making provision for the unemployed during the demobilization period, and neither bill contemplates supersession of the existing State systems of unemployment insurance. The major issue in dispute relates to the scope of the Federal-aid program and the scale and variety of the benefits to be paid. There are no great issues of principle involved, although some Senators are trying to make it appear that such is the case.

As previously pointed out, the George plan is inadequate because it leaves the schedules of benefit payments established by the States unchanged. In many States the unemployment insurance system is woefully deficient in respect to the amounts and duration of benefits paid, and in all cases the coverage is too limited. It does not seem possible, as Chairman Altmyer of the Social Security Board points out, that in the time remaining before the war ends, State employment systems can be improved sufficiently to provide needed protection against widespread demobilization unemployment. Indeed, the States could not, if they would, cope unaided with a problem that is of national scope. Federal legislation is needed to extend insurance coverage to civilian war workers of the Federal Government, who are outside the State systems. It is also required to assist

poor States and compel some niggardly rich States to raise the scale of benefits above the low levels that prevail in so many cases.

The Kilgore bill, instead of being content with raising benefits to reasonable levels, provides for payments to unemployed civilians running as high as \$35 weekly in case of persons with three dependents. To be sure, no worker could receive more than 75 percent of his weekly wages, with maximum payments limited to \$20 weekly for single individuals without dependents. Since the 75 percent limitation is computed on actual earnings obtained in the best quarter of the 3 years preceding an application for benefit payments, most unemployed former war workers would be entitled to maximum payments. Furthermore, it appears that payments under the Kilgore bill might continue for a good many years, since its provisions run for 2 years from the termination of the war. So long as a family man could draw unemployment benefits of \$35 per week he would hardly consent, except under duress, to accept a job paying less than that amount. Indeed \$40 or \$45 per week would have slight lure under such conditions.

The estimated costs of the Kilgore plan are based on so many assumptions that they amount to mere guesses. However, it is generally agreed that the costs would run to staggering figures if any considerable volume of unemployment developed—figures that cause shivers of apprehension among all but fervent believers in the power of spending to work miracles. Disregarding the cost aspect of the plan, the fact that it would put a premium on idleness should be sufficient to cause its rejection in favor of decent provisions for even the lowest paid war workers, while keeping maximum benefits low enough to make the unemployed eager to find new occupations. A suitable compromise plan could easily be devised by modifying either the George bill or the Kilgore bill without overthrowing the existing State systems of unemployment insurance.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], my distinguished colleague and beloved friend, just a moment ago made inquiry of me whether I would object to having a vote taken on the motion to recommit before I make my modest observations. I always desire to accommodate my colleagues, and particularly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], because of my great admiration and affection for him. I am sure it is proper to have the vote taken on the motion before I orate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that Senate bill 2051 be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, having accommodated my friend from Georgia, as I was very happy indeed to do, I should like to proceed at this time.

I wish to say to the Members of this body, as individuals, and as constituting one of the two branches of the Legislature of this great Nation, that we shall not be able to face the men returning from the battlefields unless we proceed at once to enact into law the Murray-Kilgore bill which is now before the Senate, and which has previously been passed upon by the Committee on Military Affairs. I may add that in connection with its consideration in the Committee on Military Affairs, the hearings covered several days.

Observers who have toured the far-flung areas of the world where Americans are daily jeopardizing their lives to beat down our enemies and preserve the integrity of our Nation are unanimously agreed that all of our men abroad dream and long for the day when, the fight won, they can return victorious to the United States to the homes, the families, the hallowed places and institutions whose value is now thrice enhanced by the bitter price we have paid to keep them secure.

Let me say at this time that I am opposed to any world-wide military force. I wish to have our boys and our girls in uniform returned home the minute the present struggle is over, and I hope and pray to the great God above that there never again will be occasion to fight on foreign shores. I pray that if there is ever again occasion to fight at all, it will be to fight only in defense of and on our own shores. The longer our men see and endure the ravages of war in other lands, the more America becomes to them an oasis in a world of arid devastation. It is a powerful image, which spurs them on to overwhelm our enemies and to return to our own beloved country to resume the arts of peace and to devote their energies to the continuing betterment of our own way of life, which I hope and pray they will find to be as good as when they left it.

What will we have to offer to the men who, all through the hell of war, carry in their hearts this glowing vision of America, the men whom we have asked to postpone all the comforts, the blessings, the fulfillment of which are the birthright of every American? Our men under arms are fighting for a land of peace and plenty. They are winning that fight. Their hopes are high. Their disillusionment will be all the more grim and their anger the more profound if they return to find that a faltering economy at home denies them the welfare, the security, and the happiness for which they have risked their lives abroad. I refer to both the men and women of our armed forces who are serving on foreign shores and in every sphere of the entire world.

Mr. President, we must not fail our fighting men. We will not shirk our responsibility to lay the basis now for a post-war America which will give meaning to their sacrifices. That must be an America whose productive mechanism is running in high, offering to every returned serviceman an opportunity to contribute his skills and participate in a national peacetime period. It is an America which will produce abundantly the goods and services which our veterans will desire, and which will provide them the means for their acquisition. It is an America which can tolerate no waste, either of manpower or of resources. The Murray-Kilgore bill has as its objective to insure such an America and the maintenance of full production and full employment, which are the only adequate guaranties of good living for the returned soldiers of our citizen Army.

The peacetime fate of our veterans is inseparable from the prosperity of the

country as a whole. To talk merely of job preference for veterans is to take a view so partial and short-sighted that it beclouds the true dimensions of the problem which faces us. Unless we take steps at once to provide work for all, the livelihood of the returned soldier will be completely dependent upon the conscience and the bounty of the individual employer—an uncertain future. And unless we take steps to assure full production, employers with the best will in the world will have few jobs to offer to the demobilized servicemen. We shall be confronted by the grim spectacle of war veterans competing for jobs with their fathers, sons, and brothers who, although they did not have the opportunity to fight for their country on the field of battle, have done yeoman service on the home front in turning out food and weapons to win the war. The outcome is easy to foretell. Wages will be forced down, unemployment will spread, purchasing power will decline. With markets for goods thus shrunken, industrial stoppages will increase, thereby throwing more persons out of work and culminating in a crisis.

We have only to consult the pages of recent history in order to know that we must act now if we are to escape the chaos that engulfed us at the end of World War No. 1, and from which we never thereafter fully recovered. It is a matter of record that servicemen fared ill in the days and months which followed the November 1918 armistice. Returned heroes formed lines at employment offices, or walked the streets vainly searching for work. In metropolitan areas, many peddled "welcome home" signs and other articles to earn enough for bare survival. A contemporary newspaper commented bitterly as follows on the plight of ex-soldiers:

In New York this is but one species of begging to which impoverished heroes have been compelled to resort. Selling newspapers on the street corners, peddling from push-carts and shoulder-slung trays is a common sight.

The city of New York stages a welcoming spectacle costing several thousands of dollars—and generously instructs the police to refrain from arresting wounded soldiers for peddling shoestrings without securing licenses.

In many quarters the ex-servicemen were met with a barren and calloused attitude. The Philadelphia Record of February 20, 1919, described as follows the employment situation on a particular railroad:

While their dissatisfaction is natural enough, the railroad can offer no relief. Those who were left behind have the opportunity to learn more of the business and have made themselves more valuable in that particular line. The greater value to the country of the fighting men's service is acknowledged, but what is to be done about it? It is the soldier's fate to take much of his compensation in glory and the consciousness of having done his high duty. It isn't comforting, but it was ever thus.

That those who have survived the hazards of battle should be subjected to the hazards of economic depression is the greatest irony and injustice. The Murray-Kilgore bill is a preventive

against depression. It minimizes dislocations by synchronizing war production cut-backs with resumption of civilian supply. It retrains and transfers workers to new jobs. It sets up a system of unemployment compensation which will maintain purchasing power at high levels, and not allow transitional unemployment to cause the crumbling of our entire American way of life. The Murray-Kilgore bill means jobs for veterans—not any old jobs at any old wage, but American jobs, jobs which utilize their skills and talents, jobs which yield them a decent recompense.

I note with deep distress and shame that anxiety over post-war job competition has already generated in some quarters sentiment for deferring discharge of servicemen until work is available for them. Let me quote from an article which appeared in the Washington Star on August 6, 1944:

Obviously, those in the forces should be discharged as soon as practicable, but it is hoped that the lesson of overrapid, unplanned demobilization after World War No. 1 will be remembered, service men and women and their families will be able to temper their very natural desires for reunion with an understanding of the problems involved. It is hoped, too, they will bear in mind the depression lasting almost 2 years that followed the brief burst of reconstruction activity after the soldiers returned in the last war.

Within the framework of military requirements . . . there is still room for seeking to coordinate the rate and order of discharges with economic considerations and the desirability of releasing older men with family responsibilities first.

And I say that is quite right.

Authorities are seeking to work out plans to brake the rate of releases to industry's ability to absorb them. This means a slowing down of the demobilization process so that industrial reconversion can get under way before the labor market is flooded.

The suggestion to slow down the demobilization process strikes me as cold-blooded. I can only say that after the sufferings, the privations, the miseries of every description which these men have endured, to keep them from their families, to subject them to the rigor and cheerlessness of military life for one day longer than our national security demands, is worse than ungenerous; it is worse than ungrateful. It is criminal and inhuman.

Insofar as I am concerned, I wish to repeat that I want our men in uniform from all parts of the world to be returned immediately to their loved ones, their homes in the United States of America, as soon as this war is over, and I pray to God that they will never again be called upon to fight on any soil, except their own native soil, in defense of their own beloved United States of America.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to read from the language of the Murray-Kilgore bill: Title III states—

The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this title are—

(a) To facilitate the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war;

(b) To maintain maximum employment in the transition from war to peacetime production;

(c) To provide for the coordination of the demobilization of servicemen with employment opportunities under a policy of demobilizing servicemen as rapidly as the military situation permits;

(d) To provide necessary training of ex-servicemen and war workers; and

(e) To provide the necessary economic assistance to returning ex-servicemen and war workers in connection with transfer, training, and reemployment.

The Murray-Kilgore bill provides that every effort shall be made to place discharged servicemen in suitable employment. But whether jobs are immediately available for all or not, when the war is won these men must be demobilized and allowed to make their readjustment to civilian life without delay—and that is my hope. The measure now before this body takes care of such contingencies as lags in reemployment. It provides a system of benefits which will maintain the ex-soldier and his family at a decent living standard during the period between demobilization and placement in a civilian job. It will eliminate the frantic competition of near-destitute men for any job at any wage, and prevent the glutted labor market and depressed wages which must inevitably follow such competition.

The Murray-Kilgore bill, which is a full production-full employment bill, thus provides the general framework for the speedy and successful reabsorption of veterans into American life. It is, in that sense, a veterans' bill. It is, in a more specific and limited sense, a veterans' bill, in that it addresses itself particularly to the problems of the returned soldier and makes provision for him apart from and beyond the measures designed for the civilian population. In making this distinction the authors of the bill were conscious of the desire which is general throughout the Nation, to manifest, however inadequately, the enormous gratitude we feel toward those who at the risk of their lives have defended our homes, our land, and our cherished liberties. The authors of this bill were further motivated by their realization that the veteran faces a much more trying period of reorientation than does the civilian war worker, and requires more generous assistance.

The Murray-Kilgore bill goes further than existing statutes to meet the requirements of a veterans' readjustment program. The Mustering-Out Act of February 1944 provides payments of \$100 for service men and women with less than 60 days' service, \$200 for those with over 60 days' service, and \$300 for those who serve overseas. The present measure increases these payments substantially, in accordance with the following arrangement: Equal monthly installments are paid at the rate of \$100 if the serviceman is without dependents, \$125 if he has one dependent, and \$150 if he has two or more dependents. Every serviceman receives a minimum of two installments, with an additional installment for each year of active service and an additional installment for overseas service. Thus, every serviceman would receive at least \$200, as compared with

the \$100 minimum to which he is now entitled, while a serviceman with two dependents, who had seen a year of active service, any part of which was overseas, would receive \$600, as compared with the \$300 to which he is entitled under existing law.

The G. I. bill of rights, which recently became law, provides unemployment compensation for demobilized servicemen at the rate of \$20 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks in a 2-year period. The Murray-Kilgore bill, which is now under discussion by this body, doubles the number of weeks during which the soldier may claim benefits and increases the amount of compensation, varying it in accordance with the number of persons dependent for their support upon the serviceman. For every week of unemployment for 2 years following the termination of hostilities or his discharge from the Army, whichever date is later, the ex-serviceman would receive \$20 if he had no dependents, \$25 if he had one dependent, \$30 if he had two, and \$35 if he had three or more. In no case would payments to civilian workers exceed this rate, and in many instances such payments would fall substantially below the level for servicemen.

Extending the duration of benefit payments is of the utmost consequence to the functioning of our economy and to the individual adjustment which the discharged serviceman must make. The Murray-Kilgore bill allows him a reasonable period of time in which, freed from financial distress and anxiety, he may reorient himself to the pursuits of civilian life. It is our thought to relieve him from economic pressure, while he rediscovers his old skills or acquires new ones, and finds employment which utilizes those skills. If we deny him this period for refocusing his interests and energies, the struggle to earn a livelihood may force him to accept substandard and unsuitable employments which depress the job market, spell personal frustration for the serviceman, and perhaps lose to us as a Nation forever the fruits of his creative talents.

I should like to speak for a moment upon the import of providing increased mustering-out payments and unemployment benefits to servicemen with dependents. The War Department informs me that of the total enlisted men and women in the Army, an estimated 32 percent have direct dependents. Of the total, 19 percent have one dependent, 10 percent have two dependents, and 3 percent have three or more dependents. Many of the families of our men have courageously accommodated their living to reduced wartime scales, giving up their material comforts as well as their men to see their country through its crisis. These families, deprived of their chief breadwinners, have had little opportunity to accumulate savings which might tide them through the period of readjustment. They need and deserve supplementary aid. Only thus can servicemen who are heads of families be placed on a comparable financial footing with those who have no dependents. Without such additional payments, families become an economic handicap, re-

ducing the veteran's mobility, thrusting him into employment while his single comrade has an opportunity to select and choose the more advantageous job. Surely we cannot wish to penalize the veterans who have family responsibilities. Yet such would be the disadvantaged status of one-third of our fighting men under existing statutes, which make absolutely no provision for increased payments for dependents.

I should like to ask how we could face our soldiers and sailors when they return, how we could face their families now, if we should deny them the increased benefits which the Murray-Kilgore bill provides—paltry enough reward for the sufferings they endure and the sacrifices they make.

For the men on the battlefields, partisan political creeds lose their identity and are merged into one democratic ideal which is their everlasting inspiration. Let it be our inspiration as well. Let no narrow partisan spirit move any one of us. Let us give to the men who are defying death for that democratic ideal the best this country has to offer, for they have amply merited it.

Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate has as one of its aides, and a very able aide, Col. Lewis Sanders, a courteous and willing gentleman, one who is actually possessed of a greater store of general knowledge than any man with whom I have ever personally come into contact. A few days ago I had a conversation with Colonel Sanders in reference to a portion of the pending bill, and as a result of my inquiry and request, on August 7, just a few days ago, he addressed to me a communication which I shall now read. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 7, 1944.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In response to your instructions I submit the following analysis of the probable operations of title III of S. 2061.

In estimating the cost of the unemployment compensation provided under S. 2061, and its effect on the national economy, its provisions must be analyzed from the basis of its purpose.

From the discussions during the committee hearings and from personal conversation with several of the Senators who are proponents of the bill it is my understanding that the primary purpose of title III is prevention of unemployment and not the furnishing of relief to those unemployed, which latter is the primary purpose of the State-controlled unemployment-compensation systems.

In the transition from war to peace we face two types of unemployment. First is the unemployment that will exist during the period of conversion and which will be occasioned by the closing or partial closing of plants during the time required to change them over for the production of civilian goods. As only a fraction of a plant's operating force can be utilized on the work of reconversion the remainder must necessarily remain idle until the change-over has been completed.

This type of unemployment will also be increased by the inability of reconverted plants to reach full production at once. Perfect synchronization cannot be achieved in reconversion and full supply of all raw materials or of all fabricated or machined

parts cannot possibly be made available simultaneously. It is inevitable that many plants will, for varying periods of time, find their output limited not by their own ability to produce but their ability to procure certain items in the general market.

The second type of unemployment is spiraling unemployment which arises both from the unemployment of the first group but even more from the fear of unemployment on the part of those still holding jobs but who become uncertain of their own future when they see large numbers of people out of work.

It is this spiraling unemployment which creates and maintains a major depression. Spiraling unemployment reaches such large figures because nearly half of those in the labor market are engaged in producing goods or rendering services which most of our people can do without for varying periods of time without suffering any notable inconvenience thereby. An example with which all are familiar is the length of time that elapsed after motorcar manufacture ceased before it inconvenienced the individual motorist.

Fear of unemployment will cause employed people to curtail their expenditures thereby creating more unemployment and thus through their own actions bringing about the very conditions they fear.

The State controlled unemployment compensation is intended to protect against want those temporarily out of work in the normal operations of a highly industrialized society.

The interim placement benefits provided for in title III of S. 2061 are intended to prevent spiraling unemployment arising from the curtailment of expenditures by those still employed but who have become fearful of the security of their jobs. It seeks to do this by giving them courage to continue their normal expenditures by insuring them a higher than a mere subsistence level of unemployment compensation on which to fall back should their job fold up. The State levels of unemployment compensation are obviously too low to inspire such confidence in a careful man as would induce him to continue his normal rate of expenditure after he feared for the permanency of his employment.

In other words, State unemployment compensation is a relief measure while the purpose of title III is as a preventive measure. I do not understand that there is behind title III any philosophy as to spending our way out of unemployment through creating purchasing power by the disbursement of unemployment benefits to individuals. The philosophy being to prevent unemployment by inducing people to continue normal purchases from earned incomes and savings by giving them an insurance sufficient to allay their fears of unemployment.

The extent of reconversion unemployment will be determined by the time intervals between termination of the different phases of the war and by the amount and skill of advance planning and the ability with which the reconversion program is administered.

Assuming the most favorable circumstances, I believe that reconversion unemployment can be held to a maximum of 5,000,000 people. Under average conditions, as to advance planning, ability of administration, etc., I think that it might reach a total of 10,000,000 people.

If spiraling unemployment results from the apprehensions engendered in the public through the existence of such widespread unemployment I would estimate that the above figures would be doubled, or would involve 10,000,000 and 20,000,000 people, respectively. To avoid extremes I will base my analysis on the more favorable conditions, which would give us 5,000,000 reconversion unemployed and 5,000,000 additional unemployed as a result of spiraling.

The purpose of title III is to prevent the idleness of the 5,000,000 persons temporarily out of jobs as a consequence of reconversion from rendering a second 5,000,000 idle through spiraling.

I would estimate the average interim placement benefits under title III to be \$25 per week and the average earnings, when employed, of those drawing the benefits to be \$25 per week. I have estimated earnings as being only equal to benefit payments because of the minimum rates set for veterans. I would estimate that under present State unemployment compensation rates this same group would average \$12 per week for 16 weeks and thereafter would cost, through various relief projects, an average of \$8 per week, from public funds, to care for each unemployed person.

Direct costs would be as follows:
Under title III:

5,000,000 unemployed at	
\$25 a week-----	\$125,000,000
Per year of 52 weeks-----	6,500,000,000

Under State unemployment compensation: 5,000,000 reconversion unemployed and 5,000,000 spirally unemployed or a total of—	
10,000,000 unemployed at	
\$12 a week-----	120,000,000
For a period of 16 weeks-----	1,920,000,000
10,000,000 on relief at \$8 a week-----	80,000,000
For a period of 36 weeks-----	2,880,000,000
Total for 52 weeks-----	\$4,800,000,000

Excess of direct cost of title III over State unemployment compensation plus relief for a period of 1 year-----	\$1,700,000,000
---	-----------------

¹ Total under George bill.
² Amount of excess cost under title III.

Indirect costs would be as follows. Indirect costs comprise the loss of national income due to the loss of production of those unemployed:

Indirect costs of title III:	
5,000,000 idle at \$25 a week-----	\$125,000,000
Lost income for 52 weeks-----	6,500,000,000
Indirect costs under State unemployment compensation:	
10,000,000 idle at \$25 a week-----	250,000,000
Lost income for 52 weeks-----	13,000,000,000

Excess of indirect costs of State unemployment compensation and relief over title III-----	6,500,000,000
Total costs per annum	

Title III:	
Direct costs-----	\$6,500,000,000
Indirect costs-----	6,500,000,000
Total-----	13,000,000,000
State unemployment compensation plus relief:	
Direct costs-----	4,800,000,000
Indirect costs-----	13,000,000,000
Total-----	17,800,000,000

Excess of total costs of State unemployment compensation insurance plus relief, over title III (under favorable conditions, i. e. minimum unemployment)-----	4,800,000,000
--	---------------

NOTE.—I have made no distinction between State and Federal payments, since all derive from the same taxpayers.

The above would represent the minimum savings if title III effected its objective, since it assumes that the period during which the unemployed would have to be provided for would be the same in each case. But if title III produces the results intended not only would the number of unemployed be much less than without it, but the period of unemployment would also be shorter.

It should again be emphasized that title III does not purport to achieve results by creating purchasing power through Government payments to individuals and "lifting ourselves by our bootstraps." It seeks to maintain the maximum possible employment through the period of reconversion by inducing normal expenditures from the huge accumulated savings that will be on hand and from the earnings of those still employed. In other words, it hopes to keep active existing resources and does not pretend to create synthetic ones.

The obvious question is: How can you be sure that title III will accomplish the result sought? The answer is: That you cannot. But you can be sure of spiraling unemployment and 10,000,000 instead of 5,000,000 unemployed if something is not done to prevent the spiraling process. Nothing else has so far been proposed.

The adoption of title III, however, would not commit the country to limitless expenditures on an unproved experiment, as has been suggested. The maximum probable weekly expenditures, and their excess over costs under present State rates, can be calculated and time limits are within the control of the Congress.

The efficacy of title III can readily be determined. If reconversion employment does not exceed 5,000,000, title III will have justified itself. If, due to adverse factors, unemployment reaches 10,000,000 but within 6 months starts to rapidly decrease, title III will probably have been the major factor. But, if unemployment reaches 10,000,000 and within 6 months does not start to rapidly decline, I would consider that title III had failed of its purpose and should be repealed and replaced by straight relief measures.

You asked me to analyze the conflict, if any, between S. 2061 and S. 2051—the George bill.

I find no conflict. S. 2051 is a straight State-aid bill making available, to such States as desire, Federal funds with which to increase their State unemployment compensation rates or the period during which payments will be made.

Title III of S. 2061 is the assumption by the Federal Government of responsibility for a national unemployment emergency that will result as part of the war effort; it is entirely distinct from normal industrial unemployment. While there is no conflict between the objectives of the two bills there is in the language since S. 2061 does not make it clear that it is dealing exclusively with a war emergency and is not imposing Federal standards on the normal State unemployment compensation systems. It should be possible to clarify this situation by slight changes in the language of S. 2061 should this be found desirable.

You asked my opinion as to the relative efficiency of public works projects and cash unemployment benefits in combating unemployment.

I believe that public works have an important though definitely limited part in any post-war program.

I think they should be limited to normal projects that would eventually be constructed in any event.

The extent of the projects should not exceed that which can be executed by the normal construction forces available after providing for all the private construction which can be counted upon.

People engaged upon them should be limited to those who would be working in their normal occupations.

Public works are too inflexible to be a major tool with which to counter a depression. It takes at least a year to prepare plans, before which no substantial amount of work can be undertaken.

The types of jobs available are too limited to meet the needs of widespread unemployment. It is more destructive to the morale of most men to place them in jobs to which they are not accustomed, as a means of relief, than it is to give them direct cash payments. (Fifteen years ago I believed the exact contrary.)

Public works are difficult to discontinue when once started, although they can be slowed down materially.

There is a fallacy that the cost of all public works are offset by the creation of new public assets. This is not always true. Public works constructed in advance of the need for them are liabilities until needed since depreciation sets in at once and they must be maintained.

My estimate of the total cost of soundly conceived public works that we could put into a post-war program is \$20,000,000,000. Of this amount completed plans are now ready for not more than \$5,000,000,000 worth of work which is, therefore, the total cost of such projects that could be started immediately and the construction would have to spread over some 3 years, or the actual rate of expenditure would be less than \$2,000,000,000 per annum.

It would take a year to prepare plans for the remaining projects and these plans would cost about \$1,000,000,000 and no substantial work could be started on these projects until the plans were completed.

Sincerely,

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery.

I may add that Colonel Sanders is now assigned to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. President, I have spoken briefly of our soldiers. Finally I wish to touch briefly on a few very important and significant highlights brought out in the hearings on the Kilgore-Murray bill. An extremely significant statement by Mr. John H. Pierson, Chief of the Post-war Division of the Bureau of Labor Economics, United States Department of Labor, to whom I shall refer later, came to the attention of the Military Affairs Committee recently through a quotation in the Capital Gist Service, a research periodical on paramount national issues published in Washington at 100 C Street SE. Mr. Pierson declared:

Whether or not the return of peace is going to usher in a period of discrimination and bitter group feelings and antagonisms and contentions that draw the lines between men and women, Negroes and whites, ex-servicemen and civilians, native-born and naturalized, depends almost entirely on whether or not we allow the unemployment situation to get out of hand.

Who knows but that the very recent and regrettable transportation tie-up and serious trouble in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, may presage similar disorders and internal strife in the future, almost anywhere and perhaps everywhere in the country, unless we here do all that lies within our power to remedy the causes of such conflicts?

There are two main objectives of the Kilgore-Murray bill that we should keep in mind: First, to establish an indiscrimi-

inatory scale of unemployment compensation as between classes and groups, and as between workers in and from different States; and, second, to minimize unemployment itself by maintaining a fair purchasing power, as I have previously mentioned, amongst the unemployed, or what amounts to a bare subsistence level.

I submit that it is essential that we use great foresight in considering the problems before us, for our action in that respect will affect millions of our people, and will have far-reaching influence upon the future welfare and tranquillity of our Nation.

Ultimately it will be far less costly to be generous in providing for our unemployed and their families, than to pursue a short-sighted and niggardly course which may engender the very bitter group feelings and antagonisms about which Mr. Pierson so wisely has warned us. I took occasion to read his statement into the record in executive session of the Committee on Military Affairs.

In considering the avoidance of a discriminatory unemployment compensation system let us analyze the situation and see who are the civilian unemployed. They are the fathers, brothers, sisters, wives, and other relatives of those in our armed forces now fighting all over the world.

I now wish to point out to the Senate what I believe is some very important and fundamental testimony by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], one of the authors of the bill, during the hearings, showing how the unemployment compensation provisions of his bill make for far better unemployment compensation for veterans with children than does the G. I. bill. The Senator from West Virginia declared, as shown on page 390 of the hearings:

They—

Veterans of World War No. 1—

found themselves dependent when they came back. I don't want to see that happen again if I can stop it.

We guaranteed him—

The selectee in World War No. 2—

a job, at least verbally, when he went to war. We said to him, "We will guarantee you a job"; then we drafted a bill which did not guarantee him a job at all. It had so many loopholes in it that you could drive a 10-horse team through it from every angle.

Now I wish to quote Mr. Schimmel, a counsel to our committee. He has given a great deal of thought, time, and study to the whole subject, particularly to the portions embodied in this bill.

I think the record should show that the soldier who comes back and who has two dependents at home will get less unemployment compensation under the present G. I. bill than his wife had been getting in her monthly allotment check.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] replied:

If there were more than one child, he would get considerably less, and that does not consider the fact that he also was drawing some salary in the service and his rations, clothing, lodging, and everything else, and he is adding to the family budget his living expenses, and yet the budget has not increased.

I quote Mr. Schimmel again:

The effect of this provision—

In the Kilgore bill—

would be to keep the compensation that is paid a single man in the service and the ex-serviceman on exactly the same level as in the G. I. bill, but would make additional allowances for dependents, plus increase in duration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I merely wish to have the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask the Senator to defer his request for a moment. I shall be through very soon, and I will yield after I finish my remarks. I do not wish to interrupt the continuity of my address at this point.

Mr. President, I predict that virtually all veterans and relatives and friends of veterans, and that means about everybody, will be for this measure when they understand correctly its provisions and operations and when they get a true picture of the over-all structure and situation.

If we would use foresight and would visualize the possible conditions in the post-war era, if we would picture the needs of the children of our heroic veterans, certainly we would see the wisdom and justice of doing everything possible for those of whom the Great Master said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: For of such is the Kingdom of God."

It is well and good, Mr. President, to give medals and erect monuments to our war heroes, but it has well been said that veterans cannot eat medals. Neither can their little children. Erecting stone or bronze monuments is not going to put more food into the mouths of the children of our veterans or more clothing on their little bodies, to protect them from the blasts of winter.

Who can claim that, with three or four children to support, an unemployed veteran or civilian can keep his children from suffering the pangs of hunger when the family income is only \$12 or \$18 a week? If we could see hungry children of the unemployed on our doorsteps we would really do something to make proper provision for them. To do less for our unemployed veterans and civilians than is provided for in the Kilgore-Murray bill would be tantamount to taking bread from the mouths of little children, including those of our war heroes.

After all, charity is supposed to begin at home. We do not seem to bat an eye when it comes to appropriating billions upon billions of dollars for the relief of people in all parts of the world, but when we consider the basic needs of possibly millions of children of the unemployed here in America, there appears to be a tendency to adopt a niggardly policy.

We have certainly been and are planning on being quite generous toward property in reconversion. Should we not be as generous and considerate of humanity as we are of property?

After all, the whole problem boils down to the humanitarian issue of whether we are or are not going to provide adequately for the children of future unemployed Americans.

Let us not be in the position of keeping bread from the mouths of hungry little children in this land which has sacrificed its all to aid in bringing freedom from want to the rest of the world. Why not now legislate with a view to guaranteeing freedom from want here at home in our own America?

Mr. President, yesterday I listened with a great deal of interest to the extremely able address of the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. REVERCOMB). He made a very fine and convincing statement. I directed to him an inquiry as to what, in his opinion, would be the cost of the administration of either or both of the bills which are now before the Senate. Whether it be the so-called George bill, or the Murray-Kilgore bill, I know it will be the right bill for the American people. I favor the Murray-Kilgore bill, but I know, as well as I know that I stand here, that the author of the George bill is as much interested in taking care of the men and women who have fought abroad and on the home front, as well as their dependents, as are the Senator from Montana (Mr. MURRAY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. KILGORE). I know that the hearts of all three of the authors of the two bills are with the millions of people who will be unemployed in this country after the war ends.

I wish to have enacted into law the best bill that Congress can enact. I shall accept the bill which this body, in its wide discretion, decides is the best bill. So far as the amount of money to be expended is concerned, I am not giving it any consideration for the reason that nothing is too good for the men and women who are ready to die for America. Nothing will be too good for the fathers, mothers, wives, and children of men who give their lives for the privilege of bringing victory to our country.

Mr. President, repeating what I said yesterday, I shall be in favor of whichever bill the Senate determines to pass, and I hope that the appropriation which will be necessary to put it into operation will be forthcoming without any delay, regardless of the number of billions of dollars which will be required. I want the men and women of our armed services who will return to this country to have the necessary funds. I want the money supplied for them in order to avoid hunger, and in order to provide for the welfare of the unemployed millions whom we shall have in this country following the war. I do not care what amount the Senator from Georgia asks for, I do not care what amount the Senator from West Virginia asks for, and I do not care what amount the Senator from Montana asks for; I want the money appropriated. I want it set aside as a special fund which cannot be touched for any other purpose. If this country goes bankrupt I want it to go bankrupt in behalf of American citizens.

Today there is a ceiling of \$267,000,000,000 on our national debt. Proper care of the veterans of this war will be a part of the cost of the war itself. Up to date the care of the soldiers of World War No. 1, according to the testimony of an officer of the Veterans' Administration, has cost \$15,000,000,000. That same officer testified that before we shall have discharged our obligations to the veterans of World War No. 1 there will be an additional cost of \$15,000,000,000, making a total of \$30,000,000,000.

In the last war we inducted into service 4,200,000 men. In the present war the men of the air, the men on the ground, the men on the sea, the men under the sea—the men and women everywhere who are a part of our military services—will represent a total inducted of more than 16,000,000, or 4 times as many as there were in World War No. 1.

Before the present war shall have ended the casualties will exceed 4 times the casualties of World War No. 1. That being the situation, and particularly in view of the fact that we propose to furnish better care for the veterans of the present war than we did for those of World War No. 1, the cost of taking care of those who participate in this war and wear the American uniform will be \$120,000,000,000. That will be a part of the cost of this war.

I understand that when the war shall have ended we will have to dispose of approximately \$30,000,000,000 worth of surplus supplies which will be on hand. We will do well if we get back 10 percent of that \$30,000,000,000.

In addition to that, I am told that we are going to be called upon to feed and clothe and support 20,000,000 people in Europe for 2 years after this war is over.

Furthermore, we have made expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars for lend-lease in order to help our allies in this war, that having been done because of the war emergency. And I hear that one of our allies, Great Britain, is going to call upon us to continue lend-lease after this war is over.

If Great Britain asks that lend-lease be continued to the extent of billions of dollars of the money of the taxpayers of this country after this war is over, I have no doubt that the Congress will vote it, but speaking for myself I shall vote against it, because I think we have arrived at a period in the history of this country when we should at least save one copper for the millions of unemployed whom we will have here.

Our debt is so rapidly spiraling and progressing upward by leaps and bounds that before this war shall have ended—I refer to the European war—we will have placed a burden upon the shoulders and the bent backs of the taxpayers of America to the extent of \$500,000,000,000.

Five years ago when I was voting against lifting the arms embargo, against the repeal of the neutrality laws, against sending our soldiers outside the continental United States before there was a declaration of war, and against lend-lease, I predicted that if we became in-

involved in the war it would cost us \$500 billion. We have already recognized the cost of the war to the extent of voting to increase the ceiling on the national debt to \$267 billion. It will go to \$500 billion. How it will ever be paid and when it will ever be paid is beyond my comprehension and beyond human knowledge.

I have before me a copy of the Washington Evening Star which contains an Associated Press dispatch from London dated August 8. I shall not read it all, but shall ask that the entire article be published in the Record. The article is headed:

British wary of issue, but want lease-lend after Nazis are beaten.

In the middle of the article it is stated:

The "mutual aid" program—

That is the program in regard to lend-lease—

should be continued until Japan is defeated.

The British are suggesting and I understand it has been discussed in high circles in this country—I do not know as to that, but it is so rumored—that lend-lease be continued after we lick the Germans. I say that it ought to be discontinued the day we lick them, because, if we were to continue lend-lease to Great Britain after the war is over every other country in the world will come forward and say, "Me too! Me too! Me too! We want more of your billions." We are going to pauperize ourselves and we are going to find out that when this whole thing is over that we will not receive a "thank you" or have a friend upon the face of the earth. I now ask that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRITISH WARY OF ISSUE, BUT WANT LEASE-LEND AFTER NAZIS ARE BEATEN

(By Alex Singleton)

LONDON, August 8.—The British unofficially took the position today that the war-born lease-lend program and reverse lease-lend should continue after the victory over Germany, but privately acknowledged that it was a touchy problem.

The subject was raised by a declaration of the National Association of Manufacturers that administrative discussions were under way on the question of using lease-lend to help support the British domestic economy.

Sources here were cautious in the discussion, but were generally agreed on these points:

1. The "mutual aid" program should be continued until Japan is defeated.

2. Greater emphasis should be given in the United States to the British part in this program.

3. Clarification should be undertaken of the section of the program dealing with final settlements.

FEAR ISSUE IN UNITED STATES

The British caution in the matter is born of a belief that the administration of lease-lend may develop into an issue during the Presidential campaign. British officials have been advised to maintain a hands-off attitude in the election.

The Financial Times said a conference was planned soon, "perhaps this week," to determine the volume of goods to be shipped to

the United Kingdom after Germany falls. The publication said there were some indications—not yet disclosed—that at least one phase of the talks might be initiated in London, while discussion of another aspect would be held in Washington.

One of the main factors in the post-war settlement of lease-lend is expected to center around the disposition of American merchant vessels built during the time Britain was concentrating on warship construction.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, we are too free with our money—not our money, no; we are not free with our money, but we are too free with the taxpayers' money; we are too free with the money that is earned by the man who produces and pays the taxes to the Government.

By the way, here is an article from the Washington Times-Herald of August 1, 1944, in connection with lend-lease. I stated a moment ago that I prophesied that if Great Britain got lend-lease after the war every other country in the world would want it. Italy is already after it. The Times-Herald article reads:

LEND-LEASE AID MAY BE EXTENDED TO ITALY

The State Department disclosed today that consideration is being given to a proposal for extending lend-lease aid to Italy. The proposal was made by the head of the new Italian Government, Premier Ivanoe Bonomi, who described his country's financial and economic condition as desperate.

Referring to Italy, I want to read from an article in the Washington Star of July 27. It will give the Senate some idea how the Italians themselves are criticizing us for debauching their own people by throwing our money all around. Mr. President, can you imagine that? The article, dated Rome, Italy, July 26, reads in part:

The Allied armies dragged behind them an "elephantine bureaucracy," the Action Party newspaper Italia Libera said today in an article criticizing both Italians and their liberators.

Criticizing Italians and the Americans who are liberating them!

The article entitled "The Allies in Italy," said there was:

"A futile waste of means and energy . . . a show of infallibility where presumptuous ignorance, ingenuousness and fatuousness are evident . . . contradictions in the acts of authorities whose powers are not precise and are contrasting."

Then the article refers to divisions and jealousies and an excess of beggars who everywhere are holding out their hands for money.

The newspaper said the Allies considered "modern comfort as the supreme good" and sought luxury, good food, and entertainment.

And so forth. I shall not take up the time of the Senate by reading further from the article, but I ask that it be published at this point in the RECORD. It shows how we are throwing our money away.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN PARTY PAPER HITS "BUREAUCRACY" OF ALLIED ARMIES

ROME.—The Allied armies drag behind them an "elephantine bureaucracy," the Ac-

tion Party newspaper Italia Libera said today in an article criticizing both Italians and their liberators.

The article, entitled "The Allies in Italy," said there was:

"A futile waste of means and energy. . . . A show of infallibility where presumptuous ignorance, ingenuousness and fatuousness are evident. . . . Contradictions in the acts of authorities whose powers are not precise and are contrasting."

Turning to the Italians, the newspaper said, "We are forced to note much servility contrasting with often unnecessary pride, a vicious tendency to trickery and imbrogllo . . . divisions and jealousies . . . an excess of beggars not always for poverty, but also for ignoble speculation . . . superficiality of judgment and irresponsibility in giving pledges."

The newspaper said the Allies considered "modern comfort as the supreme good" and sought luxury, good food and entertainment. It added that the Allies also sought out parties given by the aristocracy where "German lovers and spies of yesterday are not missing."

Allied armies were declared marked by: "An excess of requisitions often unnecessary, an excess of public drunkenness with minor incidents . . . too much money in the hands of too many people, which results in new grave turmoil in the already tormented unbalance between wages and prices . . . an abuse, fortunately infrequent, of the system which Prime Minister Churchill defines as the 'club and the carrot ends' with regard to the Italian ass."

The newspaper said, however, that never perhaps in the history of war was a people ever treated with greater trust and with greater understanding by authorities and by occupying troops.

"The Allies are waging a war which is to our advantage and they are winning it," it said. "The final result . . . will render very small and unnoticeable the inconveniences of today."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, speaking of money, we should begin to save a little. I have before me a newspaper containing an article under the headline "\$10,000 is a lot of money." The article reads:

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS IS A LOT OF MONEY (By Samuel B. Pettengill)

When the war ends the Nation's debt will average \$10,000 per family. It will be twice the total assessed value of all taxable property in the United States.

If you own a home or farm assessed for taxes at \$4,000, the average share of the debt against your property will be \$8,000.

In 1943 we spent as much as in the first 150 years of the life of the Republic.

Since Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House (counting all sums requested by him) we will have obligated the country in an amount equal to all the wealth accumulated on this continent since Columbus found it. This, on the authority of the man who knows, Senator BYRD.

This means that in 12 years we will have incurred debt equal to the savings of 452 years—1492-1944. The debt of my home city of South Bend is \$2,570,000. By July first its share of the Federal debt will be \$151,136,000.

The present interest rate on the Federal debt is about 2 percent. South Bend's share of the interest alone will be \$3,190,000 annually.

This is \$620,000 more than the total municipal debt.

In interest alone, South Bend will have to pay more each year than its total city debt.

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND ELEVEN DOLLARS AND THIRTY-SIX CENTS PER CAPITA

For less money, it could in 1 year wipe out its entire city debt. And once paid, that is paid forever. But its share of the interest on the Federal debt will have to be paid each year.

Let's look at the debt load as it stands at this time and apply the figures to your home town. The per capita national debt is \$1,511.36. Multiply your population by this figure and you will have your town's share of the Federal debt on July 1 next.

This brings the debt home.

In 1940 Texarkana had a population of 28,859. Its share of the Federal debt on July 1 next will be \$43,605,949. Its share of the interest charge will be \$920,602 annually.

Your city will tell a similar story. I mention Texarkana because it is the home of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN who is one of those who think nothing of debt when the war is over. The thought of putting any limit on debt and taxes is very obnoxious to him.

As our city fathers in council assembled voted bond issues against our homes of \$50,000 or \$100,000 at a time, they debated the matter for hours. Mass meetings often remonstrated against further debt and taxes.

But the Federal debt is "different." Why is it different?

FEDERAL DEBT—MORE DANGEROUS

As a matter of fact, Federal debt is far more dangerous than city or county debt. For the Federal debtor issues the money of its creditors, some 50,000,000 bondholders—you are one—whereas cities and counties are forbidden to issue money. Every city and county in America could go bankrupt (as 3,000 of them did since 1932) and the American dollar would still be good. Only the cities' creditors would lose. If the Federal Government, however, should ever falter in its obligations, the value of every investment, life insurance policy, social security card, etc., would melt away like snow.

The war, of course, must be won, regardless of any necessary cost. But I am talking of post-war America, post-war spending, and post-war spenders.

I want to see your War bonds paid with honest dollars, and your insurance policies and social security cards.

What about the spenders? Do they care what happens to you?

People ask me—what can I do? The answer is simple. Put an X in the right square. But first get a good man's name in front of the square.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I respectfully insist that we do any and all things possible for our servicemen and servicewomen who have been fighting courageously throughout the entire world. Furthermore, I respectfully urge that we do everything humanly possible for the men who have fought courageously in the plants and the factories on the home front in order that those on foreign fields might be properly supplied with the implements of defense and offense. I do not think there is anything too good for our soldier men and soldier women, and, as a matter of fact, I believe every Member of this body feels the same as I do about that, because we have voted for just about every request made at any time by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, by the Disabled Veterans of the World War, and by the American Legion. We have voted unanimously with them because we have recognized that they are deserving of all we could do for them, and we want to do every-

thing that is humanly possible today for those who fight on foreign shores. At the same time we want to do everything humanly possible for the men and women who have struggled and who have worked in our factories and in our plants, as I have said, to supply the needs of war, whatever the amount may be. Let us vote for it, because we have distributed our money all over the world, and given away billions of dollars. No one knows how in the world we are ever going to pay it back, but let us give what little we have left to the people who deserve it; let us give it to Americans for once. For once, let us go all out for America.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I share the views of the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I was called back to Washington when the two bills which have been under discussion were being considered. I have heard practically all the arguments, and I feel that if it were possible, we should have an over-all bill which would take into consideration the possibility of large unemployment in the post-war period, which would look after the interests of employees, of the farmers, and would particularly consider the white-collar worker, who has been the forgotten man in this era of war prosperity.

I realize that we cannot by legislation correct morals or economic ills. I think that is basic. I think we should not assume that this country, which has done so magnificently since Pearl Harbor, could fail to meet the challenge of unemployment. We have been discussing it as if it would be a reality. I think if we learn to play ball together, if we destroy the influence of those in our society who are constantly creating division, we can meet the challenge of unemployment, and that is what we should be considering.

I remember that about a year and a half ago the problem was put definitely to me that we should be foreseeing the time which seems to be coming in the next few months—cessation of war with Germany—and that we should be considering setting aside a certain portion of our strategic material, as much of it as possible, for use in manufacturing tools, so that when the war with Germany ceased the tools would be available and would enable the industry of America to go into action, united action, and meet the demands which will be made for billions upon billions of dollars' worth of goods and materials of various kinds. There is not a home in this land which does not need a tremendous amount of goods. Our highways are being worn out; our railroads are going to pieces; new transcontinental highways, washing machines, electrical products, and clothing of every kind are needed. The need is present.

The point is that when the servicemen are filtered back, as they should be filtered back, they should not be thrown onto the great body politic, without jobs being available for them. I think that is the idea behind the great G. I. bill, that we should see that each individual has an opportunity to fit into the place where he belongs, not be a square peg in a round hole. That is the job that is before us—getting the American economy into action for the peace period.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram I received a few moments ago which I should like to read into the Record. It presents the opinion of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin in relation to certain features of the Kilgore bill, and I think it expresses, by and large, the conviction of the electorate of my State. It reads:

Urgently request your support for bill S. 2051, designed further to strengthen and improve present State unemployment-compensation program in relation to problems incident to reconversion. Correspondingly, we request you completely oppose those provisions of Kilgore bill, S. 2061, that seek to retain State unemployment services for a period following the close of hostilities and also seek in effect completely to federalize present existing State programs of unemployment compensation.

Let me stop reading at that point, Mr. President. I have a campaign on my hands. I have just returned from my State. I have made a 3,400-mile journey and have spoken 135 times in 135 communities. The thing above everything else which concerns the common man on the street, on the farm, and in the village, is whether we here in Washington will use common sense—just plain horse sense. They know that we cannot simply by passing laws, as I have said, correct economic evils. They have seen us during the war period build bureaucracy on bureaucracy to the point where 3,200,000 persons are now employed in government. They have seen that and they do not understand it. Of course, they are very much concerned about that situation. They do not want any more centralization of power in Washington. They want the States to handle local problems, and the problem we are now discussing—unemployment—is a local problem in every community in America. I think by and large that if the American people were shot through with the incentive to do so, they could create overnight millions of jobs. Every store in the country needs additional help. Every farm needs help. Every little industry needs additional help. They are all crying for help. But in considering the proposed legislation, apparently all we are thinking about is providing an incentive for another "sit-down." That is not what American people want. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that the soldiers in uniform do not want doles—they want jobs. That is our job—to create an America with work and jobs.

Mr. President, I do not charge that the bill before the Senate is a political bill. I make no such charge against anyone.

I say, however, that on the basis of letters I have received from servicemen on every front and on every sea, that these boys want jobs. The measure before the Senate does not have that subject in mind at all. There is not any thought about a job connected with it. The point of much of the argument seems to be that the individual in the post-war period will not obtain a job. That is what we are talking about. We are at the wrong end of the line in this endeavor. Our endeavor should be to create jobs. Is America so weak, has America become so synthetic in her way of thinking that she is thinking simply in terms of doles? Are we missing the point?

I wish to continue the reading of the telegram:

We suggest—

This is the acting Governor of my State speaking—

that it be noted from the floor that the Governors in conference at Asheville, N. C., 1942, unanimously resolve against any attempt to Federalize the unemployment compensation system, and again in Hershey, Pa., this May, the Governors in conference unanimously oppose such type of Federalizing legislation as represented by the Kilgore and Murray bill, and likewise unanimously instituted a plan of action for the return of the employment services to the States. This is all a matter of record (George committee) and we believe should be effectively stressed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Wisconsin read the clarifying amendment which was inserted in the bill yesterday by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], which brings the administration of the bill under exactly the same rules and regulations that govern social security now as administered through the Social Security Board? If the Senator from Wisconsin will read the amendment which was placed in the bill yesterday I believe he will find it to be an answer to the telegram he has just read.

Mr. WILEY. Has the amendment been printed?

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know whether it has been printed.

Mr. WILEY. That brings up again the very emphatic point made by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that we are called upon to pass upon important matters which we have not had an opportunity to read or to think about. I have been in the Senate for 2 days now, after having come back from my State, listening to the arguments pro and con. I consider it to be a very serious matter that we should be called upon to decide what might be called piecemeal legislation when we should be considering the whole picture. Especially we should be considering the matter of bringing jobs into existence.

Mr. President, in my opinion—and apparently the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who just interrupted me feels the same way—we should preserve

intact the States' unemployment system. I believe that one of the virtues of the George bill is that it does not create any more bureaucracy. The Murray-Kilgore bill would set up an over-all system—more bureaucrats in the Federal picture—and we do not know where it would end, or how many tens of thousands more Government employees would be required. I believe also that the George bill does not place a premium on unemployment. It does not seem possible, but we have heard it definitely stated on the floor of the Senate of the United States, that a bill was introduced in the Senate providing that there should be paid to a man who would not work, more money for not working than he would receive if he worked. What are we coming to? Whose idea was that?

Something was said by a recent speaker to the effect that we are willing to pay and pay and pay. Has anyone asked how we are going to pay? Unless we can get the industrial life of America rejuvenated, unless we can get men into action so they will be builders, producers of wealth, how can we pay?

Mr. President, I agree emphatically with the statement which was made by someone that there has been too much emphasis placed on the inability of America to create employment. If those in high places would spend more time creating unity in America and providing incentives for the men of action, the men of invention, the men of ingenuity, so America could be rebuilt, we would have no unemployment.

I think that the Legion's position, as set forth in the telegram read earlier today, that the Kilgore-Murray bill would not solve our problem, is correct. There is no solution in that bill. It contemplates simply another palliative. It contemplates a return to the shot in the arm, the agency remedy we have had over the years. The real remedy lies in getting America into action, inducing her people to adopt the builders' viewpoint so they will work as one team. If the laboring man, the farmer, the small businessman, and the big businessman work together as a team, jobs will be produced. The world is hungry for our products. Many wrecked cities will have to be rebuilt. The slums everywhere will have to be eradicated. New housing must be provided. All these are demands which are in being. Let us build the spirit of America. Let us show that we in America no longer want to "termite" those who are inherently builders. Then we will find the answer. All that is required is the individual effort of every man and woman in America working as a team, and if that comes about we will rebuild America, and it will blossom like the rose. But if we carry on with the idea that we can rebuild America by paying doles or compensation to those who do not work, no matter how worthy they may be, we will never get America out of the ditch. Our opportunity is up ahead. Our railroads, our highways, our homes, our individual, civic, and national needs all will provide a market if we "play ball" together. I ask that the Senate think of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to continue this afternoon?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think we ought to continue for a while. We are losing a great deal of time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] suggested that we might take a recess at this time until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I think we might continue until 5 o'clock. I should like to make a little more progress.

Mr. HILL. Is it agreeable to the Senator from West Virginia to proceed for a while?

Mr. KILGORE. I can continue until 5 o'clock if the Senator from Georgia wishes to have me do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might reach a vote today. That now seems improbable. I think we had better continue until at least 5 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me by Mr. Martin H. Miller, National Legislative Representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in behalf of the Murray-Kilgore bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,

Washington, D. C., August 9, 1944.

HON. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Mr. A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, has requested the undersigned to advise you that the Brotherhood desires your support of the Kilgore-Murray bill, to provide a national program for war mobilization and post-war adjustment.

We are of opinion that S. 2061 should be passed now, as the war is approaching a stage where at least a portion of it may be terminated in a few months.

Great strides have been made in our productive effort in the war. We cannot afford to let that productive effort falter as we surely move on to victory. We will fail our fighting forces and ourselves if we hesitate to adequately provide a national program for war mobilization and post-war adjustment. The only reasonable adjustment that can be made is to plan for full employment after the war and to adequately provide for those who may be unemployed in the adjustment period.

We strongly urge you to favor the immediate passage of S. 2061 as the means of providing for war mobilization and post-war adjustment.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN H. MILLER,
National Legislative Representative.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum making a comparison between the Murray-Kilgore amendment and the George amendment.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON BETWEEN MURRAY-KILGORE
AMENDMENT AND GEORGE AMENDMENT

MURRAY-KILGORE
AMENDMENT

1. The Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment has not only planning and coordinating functions, but also reviewing functions, as exemplified particularly in subsection c (7), on page 5. This subsection requires the director to survey continuously all Government regulations with respect to manpower, production, and materials in order to determine whether any of them hinder full employment, and to direct any Government agency to rescind, modify, or amend such regulations which he so finds.

2. The Division of Programs and Projects, in the Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment, headed by a Deputy Director, is designed to assist the Director in discharging his planning responsibilities.

3. The National Production Employment Board (sec. 103 (a) and (b)) consists of three representatives each of industry, labor, and agriculture, and one public member who is to be chairman. It is the general function of the Board to review the programs and activities of the Director and other Government agencies with respect to war mobilization and post-war adjustment, and to make recommendations to the President, the Congress, and the Director as to legislation and policies and procedures deemed necessary by the Board to achieve the objectives of the act.

4. The special Congressional Joint Committee on Post-war Adjustment was eliminated from the draft by the majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee.

GEORGE AMENDMENT

1. The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has the same planning and coordinating powers as the Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment, but does not have any reviewing power over rules and regulations by other agencies.

2. No division of programs and projects and no deputy director is provided for in the bill and the entire planning responsibility rests upon the Director, who, however, is authorized to employ such deputy directors as he may find necessary to carry out his functions (sec. 101 (d), p. 5, line 5).

3. An Advisory Board (sec. 103) is created consisting of three members each of industry, labor, agriculture, and the public. One of the public members is to be chairman. The Board has only advisory functions and not reviewing functions and is called upon to make recommendations to the Director, but not to the President and to Congress.

4. The special Congressional Joint Committee on Post-war Adjustment, as proposed in the draft, is preserved in the George proposal (sec. 104).

MURRAY-KILGORE
AMENDMENT

5. The Chairman of the War Production Board has the function of prescribing policies for the integration of resumption of civilian production with curtailments of war production.

6. Title III contains provisions for education, training, and unemployment compensation, and coordinating powers with respect to manpower are given to the Work Administrator.

GEORGE AMENDMENT

5. The responsibilities placed on the Chairman of the War Production Board are placed upon the Director.

6. No provisions are contained with respect to education, training, and unemployment compensation except for Federal loan fund and the covering in of Federal employees under State laws. The Work Administrator has the powers which are now held by General Hines under Executive order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will not insist upon a quorum at this time. I think perhaps the Senator from West Virginia might proceed for a little while, and then we might be ready to take a recess. Does the Senator feel that we must have a quorum now?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I will not ask for a quorum if the Senator from West Virginia does not wish to have me do so, but otherwise I should like to press the request. The hour is growing late, and it seems to me that instead of starting a new speech by the Senator from West Virginia, who must be tired and worn out by his efforts in connection with this bill, we might take a recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have been very patient about the pending legislation. If there is any reason to be here to formulate reconversion legislation, the Senate ought to be willing to do the job. It is only a little after 4:30 o'clock. Of course, the war will end some time. There are many features and phases of reconversion which ought to be given consideration, but there has been a persistent insistence that we deal with unemployment compensation, and therefore we ought to deal with it in some way, without further delay. Of course, there will be cut-backs. There will be a conclusion to the war, and we should make some provision against that time. I cannot see why we should not proceed even until 6:30 every night, until we shall have concluded consideration of the bill. If the Senator wishes to call for a quorum, that is his right; but if we have a quorum call, I think we should continue until considerably past 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I completely concur in what the Senator from Georgia has said. We came back here, as

we believed, to meet emergent conditions which we thought we saw arising because of success on the battle fronts. We thought the time was at hand for the Congress to legislate with respect to conditions which we anticipate are to follow the cessation of hostilities.

Legislatively speaking, we have been here for almost a week, and have made comparatively little progress. I feel that the point of no quorum should not be made now, although I recognize the Senator's right to make the point. I believe that the Senate ought to continue the consideration of the pending bill. I think we should conclude it at the earliest possible moment. We shall not be able to conclude it within what I believe to be a reasonable time if we are to consume the time of the Senate by quorum calls, and if we are to close our deliberations almost in the middle of the afternoon. I hope we may continue. If there is to be a quorum call, my hope is the same as that of the Senator from Georgia, that we may continue for some time longer today in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree with the two distinguished Senators that in connection with the consideration of this vital bill, which so greatly affects the future welfare of the American people, we should have full and immediate consideration by the Senate. The distinguished sponsor and author of the bill is about to address us, and only about 25 or 30 Senators are present in the Chamber. If it is proper to proceed at twenty minutes to five, or a quarter to five, it is proper to proceed only if Senators are present to listen and to carry on the business of the Senate. I believe that little is to be gained by addressing important arguments to empty seats. If what Senators desire is to go through the motions of legislating, that is one thing. If we are here conscientiously and fairly to deliberate, that is another thing, and we should have a quorum call and a full attendance of the Senate.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from West Virginia desires to have me withhold my request for a quorum, and wishes to address the Senators who are now present, I shall, of course, very cheerfully abide by his decision.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from California. I make that request; and, as suggested by him, I will go through the motions of addressing empty seats on some matters which I think are pertinent.

Mr. President, the early editions of the Washington Post of today quoted the junior Senator from Nebraska as objecting to one of the experts loaned to the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, on the ground that he had received many telephone calls from the Political Action Committee. Evidently the junior Senator from Nebraska has not had the time

in the last few months to read the trade papers of the American labor movement in all its phases. Anyone who had read those publications and who had been more fully acquainted with the statements of Senators interested in the pending legislation would have known that the fact that all labor groups have been constantly consulting many Senators and their staffs on this subject matter has been long a matter of public record. The labor organizations themselves have shouted this fact from the housetops. Members of the Senate in official and unofficial statements and comments have made it widely known that all branches of American labor have been constantly discussing this subject with Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and their assistants and staffs. Anyone who had the time to read the hearings on this important legislation and the official publications of all branches of the American labor movement would have known that no subject in years has so commanded the interest and the concern of American labor as has and does this subject.

Anyone who has had the time to read one of the best edited and most informative newspapers in the United States, the weekly newspaper published by the railroad labor unions under the title of Labor would have seen that railroad labor is giving more space, more time, more energy, and more action to this subject than to almost any other subject in years. In issue after issue of that newspaper front-page articles have been published dealing with this subject, disclosing the fact that labor has been in constant touch with Members of the Congress on the subject of this legislation.

Anyone reading the American Federationist, published by the American Federation of Labor, or the press releases issued by the American Federation of Labor would have seen that the American Federation of Labor has felt similarly on this important subject and has acted similarly. That, likewise, is true of the C. I. O. News, the publication issued by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and of numerous publications of international unions and their locals affiliated with the railroad labor unions, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Proper legislation on this subject is so vital to the American workingman and workingwoman that on this matter all branches of organized labor have joined hands from the start. This is one of the few occasions on which they have done so. A reader of the daily newspapers would have observed early in May of this year the fact that a letter had been written to all Senators, signed jointly by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives Association. The letter was addressed to all Senators, under date of May 1, 1944, and in it Senators were urged to give immediate consideration to and to accomplish the passage of the bill which I, along with other Senators, have had the honor to sponsor.

Why is organized labor so deeply concerned with this subject? Its members know that the workingmen and workingwomen of this country must have jobs, not only for their individual well-being but also for the safeguarding of our economic system. They remember the excesses of inflation and depression which followed the last war. They remember the miseries which fell upon tens of millions of Americans. Is it any wonder that they would be interested in this subject? Is it any wonder that on this subject they would want to petition Congress and its committees and its individual Members? Is it any wonder that they would try to reach Members of Congress and their staffs, to convey all suggestions which seem to them reasonable and proper on the subject of this legislation?

Is there anything discreditable in the fact that any citizen of the United States or any organization of citizens of the United States communicates with a Member of the United States Senate or his staff, as may have been insinuated? I and my staff—and I am sure the same is true of other Senators and their staffs—have received innumerable personal visits and telephone calls on the subject of the pending legislation from representatives of all branches of organized labor in the last few months, just as we have received telegrams from the Governors of States, from State social-security organizations, from manufacturers' associations, and from others. Was any discredit to be attached to that?

The newspaper article appearing today in the early editions of the Washington Post, in the course of which appears the interview with the junior Senator from Nebraska, which, strange to say, does not appear in a later edition, conveys the information, which the Senator from Nebraska also conveys in his interview, that members of the staff of the subcommittee of which I have been serving as chairman had received several telephone calls from representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations or of the Congress of Industrial Organizations' Political Action Committee. Let the picture be made complete. As chairman of the subcommittee, I, together with members of the staff of the subcommittee, have received scores and hundreds of telephone calls from representatives of all branches of the American labor movement. Indeed, if I were to estimate from which branch of organized labor the telephone calls and personal visits have been the largest in number, I should be inclined to estimate that the older the labor organization, the more frequently it has been in touch with our subcommittee members and with the staff.

It might be useful for anyone interested in this subject to turn to the hearings of the subcommittee which had the bill before it. There he will find that among the foremost supporters of the legislation, which I had the honor to propose, are William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor and chairman of its committee on post-war policy. Anyone who had followed the course of

the legislation would have noted that on April 4, Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor and chairman of its committee on post-war planning, appeared before the subcommittee of the United States Senate Military Affairs Committee and made a notable statement on the urgent need of passing an earlier version of the bill, which I have had the honor to sponsor. The American Federation of Labor and Mr. Woll were, in fact, the first to support the legislation.

I would like to quote from the statement Mr. Woll made on April 4. Mr. Woll, who was the first labor witness before the subcommittee, stated:

Human rights are quite as important as property rights. The workers in this country, whether in the armed forces or on the production line, have as much right to have their interests considered and have their security provided for as have the property owners. It cannot be taken for granted that the provisions for the protection of property owners would automatically mean full employment at adequate wages for workers.

Mr. Woll went on to say that—

Recommendations for reconversion in the Baruch-Hancock report . . . are implemented in S. 1823.

I recall that that fact was disputed earlier today in the debate in the Senate. But I still refer to that report and to the implementation contained in the bill.

Mr. Woll further stated:

We urge that the provisions embodied in S. 1823 be substituted for those in S. 1730.

For the benefit of those Members of the Senate who have not had the opportunity to hear or to read Mr. Woll's illuminating statement, I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD. I know of no statement which so clearly points out the need for this urgent legislation, and I am honored by the whole-hearted support of that great organization, the American Federation of Labor, of the legislation which I have been privileged to assist in introducing. Experts attached to that great organization have been in constant consultation with me and with members of my staff, as well as with other Senators and their staffs, in an attempt to perfect this legislation. Again I say, where is the crime in having any group of persons insist on seeing their legally elected representatives or their staffs, and consulting with them on legislation which affects them?

A large portion of the burden in this struggle—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Not until I have finished what I am about to say. Then I will yield for a question.

A large portion of the burden in this struggle for proper legislation during reconversion has been carried by the railroad labor unions. Experts who have worked with these unions for years have submitted their views and their suggestions to those of us who have worked on this legislation and to our staffs. As a matter of fact, the staff of the Railway Retirement Board drafted and redrafted and worked out title III of the bill. I

believe it is accurate to say that of all the specific concrete suggestions on the subject of this legislation made by any of the labor unions and deemed by our subcommittee fitting for inclusion in the bill, a larger portion consists of proposals and suggestions made by the railroad labor unions and experts who have worked with them than by any of the other labor organizations or persons associated with them. When it comes to the general outlines of the bill submitted by our subcommittee, I should say that insofar as the proposals of any of the labor organizations were deemed sound by this subcommittee and its members, the general outlines proposed by the American Federation of Labor played a larger part in the bill finally drafted than did the suggestions of any other labor organizations.

In this connection I should like to call the attention of Senators to the statement of Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, made on April 4 before the Subcommittee on War Contracts of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Mr. Woll then stated:

The Kilgore bill—

He was speaking of the so-called Murray-Kilgore bill—

does implement that policy (of insuring the fullest possible employment in private industry), as well as the policy of providing adequate safeguards to industry. There are minor changes which might be made in the bill to clarify or improve some of the provisions. But the general policies closely resemble those which the executive council of the American Federation of Labor unanimously endorsed in January of this year.

This was publicly stated by Mr. Woll and is available to everyone in his testimony before the subcommittee—part 10, April 4, 1944, pages 785 to 786.

I now submit the statement made by Mr. Woll, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is of vital importance to labor, as it is to our whole economy, that the Congress should establish the general policy that demobilization of the armed forces and of workers must be integrated with the reconversion of industry.

The goal toward which we should aim is that discharge and reemployment should go on approximately at the same rate. To the extent that this is not done there will be unemployment which if it assumes large proportions, will be a threat to our economy. Neither industry nor workers can make plans for the future, prepare to expand and buy, unless they can base their plans on policies established by legislation which is not subject to sudden changes. Nor can Government agencies function without well-defined policy directives.

The manpower muddle we are in now is due in large part to the fact that about 30 Government agencies are responsible in one way or another for labor matters. Labor, industry, and Government agencies are in a state of frustration with all these overlapping jurisdictions in this time of emergency. How is it possible to cooperate with all the different requests or orders or policies when they are at such variance with each other, and when each agency considers its own inter-

ests, but does not integrate those interests with the necessities of other agencies?

We readily agree with the objectives as outlined in S. 1730 to provide for the transition period. They are implemented however, only as far as property protection is concerned.

But human rights are quite as important as property rights. The workers in this country, whether in the armed forces or on the production line, have as much right to have their interests considered and have their security provided for as have the property owners. It cannot be taken for granted that the provisions for the protection of property owners will automatically mean full employment at adequate wages for workers. They will help toward that goal. But they are not in themselves enough to achieve it.

Consider for a moment the migration problem. Whole areas and whole States have changed their populations during this war. Many of these areas and States will find their populations permanently increased. Others will be decimated. Policies established for the transition period, including the present time, will have their impact on these population changes. But in any case there will have to be a considerable redistribution of population. Workers who have migrated to congested war areas, often at the sacrifice of family life and decent housing and eating conditions, face an entirely different prospect on reconversion to peacetime production. Instead of the certainty of a job—a certainty which made it possible for them to undergo themselves the expense of the migration—they will face uncertainty under conditions which were none of their making and which they are individually impotent to change, unless plans are made now for what is a national responsibility.

It seems to us unrealistic to depend so greatly on the savings of workers to carry the economy through the transition period. There have been many articles written and speeches made about the enormous savings of workers and the pent-up consumer demand and how these factors will provide a market for industry which in its turn will provide employment. Government fiscal policy now and projected for the future is also at present based on the same general theory. This attitude seems to us like gambling on what may be a myth. There have been estimates of savings with totals averaged among the workers. The totals are impressive, but they include such items as paying off debts and mortgages, buying homes, premiums for life insurance, etc. Such savings are permanent investments, rather than savings in spendable cash. Moreover, goods will not be bought with savings—except for the minimum necessities—if the worker is out of a job and has no certainty as to when he or she will get one. If an investigator came to my door today and asked me what I should like to buy after the war, I might well say that I should want a new car or a television set. But if, after the war, I had no job, ordinary prudence and common sense would prevent me from spending for such things any of the savings I might have.

It is quite true, and we are glad that it is true, that thousands of families have moved up in the income scale. It should be remembered, however, that the lower income families were living at a standard below that set by the Department of Agriculture as a minimum for health and decency. As their incomes increased with better jobs, or more members of the family worked, they did what was quite natural—improved their standard of living to a decent level. These families, we believe, have no savings which can be used to support our industrial economy. Increased cost of living and increased taxation have brought down their income spendable for goods other than necessities to

little more than nothing. In addition, there are thousands of families of servicemen, or others which have lost their breadwinner whose incomes are lower than they were before the war. According to an O. P. A. study on families and single consumers for 1942, over half of the total had incomes of less than \$2,000 per year and the average savings in this group of about 23,000,000 families and single consumers was only \$57. No figures are available for 1943, but it is quite probable that any increase in family income has been offset by increased taxes and increased cost of living, so that there would be no greater ability to save. In the sale of E bonds of \$25 denomination, the ones bought mainly by workers, almost one-fifth of those sold had had to be redeemed by the first of this year. It becomes obvious that the savings of half the families in the United States cannot be depended upon either to support them or an industrial market in the transition period.

Servicemen are not professional soldiers. Within a few months of the time of their discharge from the armed forces, service men and women will become part of the civilian working population. They should, of course, be given the advantages promised them of having priorities on jobs. But we certainly do not want an army of unemployed as a substitute for an army under arms. Our Army is made up of civilians who want to return to civilian life as quickly as possible. At least a million and a half of the men and women in the armed forces are members of the American Federation of Labor. So it is of special interest to us that everything possible be done to safeguard the security of demobilized servicemen as well as war workers, to prevent unnecessary suffering arising out of the termination of war contracts and the reconversion of industry, and to insure the reemployment of discharged servicemen and discharged workers with the minimum of delay. Although every possible stimulus should be given, also, to planning and execution on the local level, these safeguards should be taken care of by policy directives on a national basis, since the emergency itself is national.

The recommendations for reconversion in the Baruch-Hancock report, recommendations with which there is general agreement, are implemented in S. 1823. I quote from pages 76-77 of the report as follows: "The war has brought abnormal conditions of employment which have given rise to human problems which become reflected in every situation requiring administrative or legislative decision. These problems cannot be separated from the others. They will be greater or smaller directly according to the way in which such programs as contract termination, surplus disposal, the mustering out from the armed forces, public works, social security, education and benefits for veterans, and international agreements are handled. There is no way of isolating problems of human interests from others. But there is no necessity for losing sight of the personal element in any of the fields of adjustment—and there will be no excuse for ignoring it." We fully agree with this statement and urge that these fundamental recommendations of the Baruch-Hancock report be turned into legislative directives at the earliest possible moment. The general policies as outlined in S. 1823 we approve, both as far as industry is concerned and as far as discharged servicemen and workers are concerned. We urge that the provisions embodied in S. 1823 be substituted for those in S. 1730, and that the provisions of S. 1718 in regard to contract termination be included in S. 1823, thus bringing the major aspects of reconversion under one direction. Human demobilization and reemployment cannot be separated from property reconversion. They are part—and a vital part—of the same

problem. We would be opposed to a bill which provided only for the security of property and did not implement the policy as stated in S. 1730, "to insure the fullest possible employment in private industry during the period of transition to civilian production after the cessation of hostilities and thereafter."

The Kilgore bill, S. 1823, does implement that policy, as well as the policy of providing adequate safeguards to industry. There are minor changes which might be made in the bill to clarify or improve some of the provisions. But the general policies closely resemble those which the executive council of the American Federation of Labor unanimously endorsed in January of this year.

Title I of the bill creating an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment gives the authority and responsibility of legislative sanction to an agency which must have such sanction to perform its functions. It would be unworkable to have two offices—one for war mobilization and one for war demobilization—with conflicting jurisdictions. The fusing of these agencies into one seems to us a reasonable solution. The importance of this Office in its impact on our whole economy and the necessity for its working closely with the Congress are so great that it seems wise to deviate from the usual practice of permitting a director to choose freely his own assistants, and to provide, as has been done in this bill, that the heads of his chief coordinating agencies, as well as the Assistant Director, be confirmed by the Senate. The American Federation of Labor has urged that the reconstruction agency be directed by a board made up of representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture, each contributing from expert knowledge to a solution of specific and over-all problems. The Kilgore bill provides for the use of this experience in a National Production-Employment Board and provides for consultation with this Board on basic policies and programs.

In addition to the staff provided for this Board, we suggest that there be created a Technical Committee to provide technical advice to the Board. This Technical Committee should consist of outstanding authorities in the field of monopoly and competition, both from private life and from such Government departments as Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The purpose in having this Technical Committee would be to provide the Board and the Director with professional advice in regard to the degree of competition within or between various industries, whether competitive profits or otherwise prevail in any industry, and what the effect would be on such industries of projected action. Both the members of this committee and the members of the Board should have full access to all material in the Office or in other Government departments necessary to their function. Preservation of a free competitive system, with equal opportunity to all to enter that system, is the key to industrial expansion and full employment. Particular emphasis should be placed on the needs of small business, and the entrance of new business in the economy.

It is further suggested that machinery be established to provide for public cooperation and participation in the program, by full public knowledge as to policies and directives and by sessions which will provide the general public or organizations with an opportunity to express their views as to the functioning of the Office. Mutual understanding on the part of the officials and the public is essential to its success.

Since this Office will have to work closely with the Congress, and will undoubtedly need further enabling legislation, it is suggested that there be included in S. 1823 a section establishing a joint committee of the

Senate and the House with which conferences may be held at frequent intervals on matters of policy, and which will thus become familiar with the problems confronting the Office and with its functioning.

A dangerous omission in our present governmental organization is that of a central agency established by legislative act and entrusted with the duties of making realistic surveys of matters relating to the economic and social welfare of the Nation, States, communities, and the people; of reviewing progress made; and of suggesting on the basis of such surveys and reviews the necessary programs for correction or expansion. This omission is remedied by title II in S. 1823 through the creation of a bureau of programs. Our economy is disturbed and disrupted in our supreme effort to win the war, and the delicate and complex interrelationships between industry and industry, agriculture and industry, labor and industry, between all of them and the Government, and again with the consumer, have been distorted from the interrelationships which existed in a peacetime economy. It is unlikely that they will ever again be as they were in the past. Nor do we want them to be the same, I am sure. That would mean going back with a sudden contraction to an economy with half of our present productive capacity, with a resultant depression worse than that of the thirties and instead of the unemployment of about 9,000,000 in 1940, an unemployment of some 19,000,000. Everything possible should be done to obviate such a disaster by carrying out the primary objective of making it possible for private enterprise to operate at a full employment level. But this cannot be done overnight. It is thus only exercising due caution to have an agency instructed to work out programs for necessary public works, including those which will give employment to white-collar workers, housing, and other improvements which have been impossible in the war period, as well as means to stimulate industrial and regional development, local community planning, etc. The functions of the bureau of programs appear to us to be long overdue. No efficient business concern could survive for any length of time without plans for the future. Nor can a government.

Title III of S. 1823 gives the War Production Board the coordinating powers it must have to insure a reasonably smooth transition from military to civilian production, and yet makes its functions an integral part of the over-all administration of demobilization and reconversion. The provisions under this title will clarify responsibilities which overlap with one or more agencies at the present time and will, we believe, make for better administration.

The functions as established for the War Production Board do not include the settlement of war-contract claims. We suggest that there be embodied in this bill another title which would include the general provisions of S. 1718, establishing an agency to settle contract terminations and interim financing, with special consideration for the needs of small business. It is particularly true now when so many of the war contracts have gone to big business and when there has been such a high mortality rate in small business, that there is increased danger that free competition will tend to disappear from our economy. In the interests of developing and expanding new lines of endeavor, of stimulating free competition, of equal opportunity for any individual to go into business for himself, and of providing a means for quick conversion to civilian production, small business should be given priorities and all other aid possible.

A major concern in over-all policymaking is the disposal of surplus property and plants. Such disposition, of course, has to be integrated with the other objectives of S. 1823. It is well provided for in title IV. We would

urge that the basic criteria in deciding on disposition of surplus property, equipment, or plants should be, Will this decision increase production at competitive prices and employment at adequate wages? It seems wise to provide, as has been done in section 408, that there should be attached to every contract for the sale, lease, or other transfer of a plant a provision requiring that it be kept in operation and production for 3 years. This would prevent its being taken over for the purpose of keeping it out of competition.

Experience after the last war taught us a bitter lesson in regard to the disposition of raw materials and surplus property. There was widespread speculation, creation of artificial shortages through hoarding, spiraling prices, and then sudden deflation from which it took us a long time to recover. Specific enabling legislation, which was lacking during and after the last war, should be enacted to prevent these things from occurring again on a much vaster scale.

The effect of cut-backs and cancellation of war contracts, with no plans for either new contracts or resumption of production for civilians and with no provision for the reemployment of workers thrown suddenly out of their jobs, may already be seen in the manpower muddle and the disintegration of certain congested areas of war production. We may expect that, since we are now approaching the peak of the war, these problems will from now on become intensified.

The provisions in title V of S. 1823 allow for a constructive program which is not just a palliative but one which holds real hope for the future—one which will relieve the sense of fear and insecurity which would otherwise be a bar to active cooperation on the part of workers in the transition period and beyond. Workers do not want charity. They want jobs. They will need aid in finding those jobs, in migrating to them, and in receiving unemployment compensation until they get them. In connection with the last need, there has been some discussion of having the Government allow as a permissible cost to concerns having war contracts dismissal wages to war workers. Certain unions do have dismissal clauses in their contracts, and dismissal wages do provide some protection to workers. Nevertheless, there are formidable administrative difficulties and some question as to the advisability of putting the disbursement of Government funds in the hands of private individuals (as would probably have to be done through the relationship between prime contractors and subcontractors). There would also be discrimination against workers who are actually doing war work but not under Government contract, and lack of wide enough coverage to take care of those who have earned the right to unemployment compensation but who would be unable to receive it through State funds. Moreover, the responsibility in a national emergency is not that of the States or private individuals, but that of the Nation.

In this emergency during the transition period the provision for emergency unemployment compensation would be the most equitable method of providing for discharged workers and in coordinating this program with the provisions for discharged service men and women. There seem to us to be good provisions under this title for the maximum potential contribution of the workers to the future of this country not only through the preservation of their self-respect and morale, but through provisions for their better education and training.

During the transition period we urge that price control and rationing be continued for the purposes of preventing inflation and of equitable distribution at reasonable prices of scarce goods. We suggest that the criterion in relaxing these controls be based on ability to produce a given commodity sufficient to

satisfy the demand at the ceiling price or below. Provisions for these controls should be included in S. 1823 in order that they may become part of the integrated over-all program.

It has been a hard lesson for us to learn, as we have, in selection for the draft and for essential work what lack of education, bad housing and living conditions, and the depression conditions of unemployment, have done to those upon whom we have had to call in this war emergency. We hope that it will never happen again. In any case we can learn from previous experience and in a statesmanlike manner we can lay the legislative foundations for a sound expanding economy.

Mr. KILGORE. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if he is attempting to defend himself in the statement which he made by shifting it over onto my shoulders?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I am not attempting to defend myself. I am merely making the Senator from Nebraska aware of the facts, and asking him if he was making an implication of any kind in the purported interview he had concerning those facts.

Mr. WHERRY. You are drawing your own conclusions outside the facts. If you will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will see that I made no such charge on the floor of the Senate yesterday, and if you will examine a copy of the Washington Post, the only newspaper which I saw, you will find that there is no statement in it except the statement of the senior Senator from West Virginia. It indicates that you stated that there had been many telephone calls between the one who was present in the Senate yesterday, a Mr. Schimmel, and the Political Action Committee. Mr. Schimmel approached the Presiding Officer and spoke to him. He is a member of your staff. Your statement that he was associated with a Mr. Hobbs and a Mr. Webber, formerly of O. P. A., and now associated with the Political Action Committee, clearly indicts Mr. Schimmel as having a very close contact with the Political Action Committee, and especially his former associates on that committee. Furthermore, the statement made by Mr. Schimmel in the presence of the senior Senator from West Virginia sets out that he drew the bill—that he was the master mind.

Mr. KILGORE. Just a minute.

Mr. WHERRY. That information was in the statement which I read, which had been given out by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, and I made no such charge at all. Yesterday I merely raised the point of order that no one who is not a Member of the Senate—I do not care who he is or where he comes from—has the right to approach and speak to the Presiding Officer. If the Senator from West Virginia wishes to draw an inference today and indict himself by statements he made to the press connecting him with the C. I. O. and the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., he should not put the responsibility upon my shoulders. I did not make the charge against him. The Senator has made it against himself.

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator from Nebraska has concluded, I should like to ask him whether or not the quotations contained in the first and second editions of the Washington Post represented a correct statement of what the Senator from Nebraska said, or if the newspaper made a mistake. If the newspaper made a mistake I will withdraw anything I said with reference to the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I will stand by any statement which I gave to the press. I did not sit up last night to see what I had said or what you had said. The statement which I made I now make on the floor of the Senate—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Is the Senator from Nebraska addressing the Chair?

Mr. WHERRY. I have been addressing the Chair and also answering the questions of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that if the Senator from Nebraska would address the Chair we would get along better.

Mr. KILGORE. I asked the Senator if he had read the earlier edition of the Washington Post, and if he had made the statement which was therein quoted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when I used the word "you" in my discussion with the Senator from West Virginia I meant the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Hereafter I will address my remarks to the Presiding Officer.

I wish to say in conclusion that the question which was asked—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, and not for a speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from West Virginia refuse to yield to me any further?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nebraska may make a speech later if he desires to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I should like to call the attention of the Presiding Officer to the fact that there is no opportunity to answer a question when the Senator holding the floor will not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, during the past 2 days this Chamber has resounded with outbursts of Senators claiming that \$35 a week for interim placement benefits for an unemployed worker with a wife and two or more children was extravagance. Contrary to the plan, it has been represented that \$35 a week would be paid to everyone regardless of his dependents or his condition and success in life. At least, that would be the natural inference to be drawn by a person with good hearing. I personally have only one good ear, and I could hear only portions of the statement. As the language of the bill clearly states, \$35 would not be paid except to a worker who had received an average of at least \$38 a week during his base period, and, in addition, had to support at least three dependents. The effect of those qualifications alone, on the basis of earnings of workers during the base years, would, according to sta-

tistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, exclude 50 percent of the beneficiaries from receiving the maximum benefit on account of earnings. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, only one-fourth of the 50 percent would meet dependency qualifications. The effect of the provision would be to limit the maximum benefit to about one out of every eight workers. Yet, in spite of those limitations, the bill has been grossly misrepresented. We have seen dire pictures painted of the alleged effects of the payment of \$35 a week for the maintenance of a family of four. We have heard that it would break the economic back of this Nation and convert it into a Nation of idlers.

Mr. President, what does \$35 a week mean in terms of things necessary in order to sustain life? Exhaustive studies by the Department of Labor enable us to answer the question in very great detail. For the detailed study I respectfully refer to the report on that subject. But allow me to present a few items for the benefit of the Senate.

In 1935 the Bureau of Labor Statistics supervised an exhaustive study into the minimum cost of maintaining a family of four persons. It required \$1,260 a year on a minimum basis at that time. Making allowances for increase in prices which have taken place since that time, approximately \$1,700 a year would now be required. Other increases, not measured by price changes but admitted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, would appreciably increase the cost of living, bringing the cost of the family budget up to more than \$1,800 a year, which is the amount that \$35 a week would provide.

Let us look into the standards of living provided by \$35 a week, as shown by this study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator has considered the provisions of the State laws. Let me read the provision of the Michigan statute:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits—

(a) For any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States.

In other words, as I read the provision—and I understand it is a standard provision in compensation laws—if we should now pass the George bill with the amendment which has been proposed, we would find that every State law would prohibit any of the State money being paid out to the unemployed. In other words, the Federal Government would be furnishing all the money for unemployment benefits. Has the Senator considered that provision?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. The provision is that what is paid under the State unemployment compensation provisions of each particular State shall be charged up against the amount to be paid the worker.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the way the law reads. The law reads that if one makes application, or receives any compensation under any other unemployment act or the law of any other State or of the United States, he is disqualified from getting any compensation from the State of Michigan, or wherever the law is applicable; and this is a universal provision of law.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator well realizes the ruling of the court in cases of that kind. I think a study of the proposal will demonstrate that that matter has been taken into consideration. The section to which the Senator refers is the same as that provided in every State law. For instance, in the State of Michigan a man could not draw compensation from the State of Pennsylvania and the State of Michigan simultaneously, nor could he draw as a member of the railway retirement fund from that fund and from the State of Michigan simultaneously. It would be contrary to public policy. The Senator is also aware of the fact that under a contractual relationship existing between practically all the States and the Railway Retirement Board, in connection with which this statute was studied, that very *modus operandi* is followed with reference to the railway retirement fund and social security benefits. In other words, railway retirement funds are paid in the Senator's own State by his own Michigan board. In other words, the benefit under this bill is cumulative benefit, not an alternative benefit.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield for another question, let me say that I do not find such wording in the bill. I wonder how an unemployment insurance commissioner could actually make any payment from the State fund when the provision reads, "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits." Would it not be necessary, under this provision, that each State legislature hold a session and repeal or alter that section so as to permit payments?

Mr. KILGORE. That is not the view that has been taken by the Social Security experts who have studied the bill. They hold that this is a cumulative payment, augmented by the Federal Government, over and above the State payments, that the State can proceed and pay, and the Federal Government augments the payment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question about the State law. Would the same rule he has just read apply to the civilian employees of the Federal Government provided for in the George bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. They would never receive any compensation from the State of Michigan. They would receive it wholly from the Federal Government.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the law of Michigan, if either of the proposed provisions were enacted, then the State of Michigan would not pay any unemployment compensation whatever.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not answer the question in that way. The George bill does not provide for any payment by the Federal Government except

to Federal employees, and they would never be entitled to compensation under the Michigan law. I am merely wondering about this provision. I wondered how it would be construed.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Apropos of what my distinguished colleague from Michigan has said, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram I have received from Richard S. Rolfe, executive director of the Unemployment Compensation Division of New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., August 10, 1944.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator:

New Hampshire Unemployment Compensation Division law reads: "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: (f) For any week or part of a week with respect to which he is seeking to receive or has received payments in the form of unemployment compensation under an unemployment-compensation law of any other State or under a similar law of the Federal Government." Commissioner is authorized to revise law so that provisions will conform with minimum standards for all States set up by Congress but section quoted above prevents payment of benefits concurrently with Federal benefits.

RICHARD S. ROLFE,
Executive Director, New Hampshire Unemployment Compensation Division.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that if a man or woman worked for 3 months, we will say, at \$50 a month, and the only work that man or woman did during the entire war was that 3 months' work for \$150, such a person would be qualified to receive unemployment compensation for the rest of the period provided in the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Of course, under those circumstances, I hardly know what they would have existed on during the 2 years and 9 months they had no other earnings.

Mr. TAFT. It might well be that a man's daughter lived at home and did not work, but would go to work for 3 months, and the only work the daughter did, we will say, during the entire war was 3 months' work, or perhaps only 2 months' work, for which she received \$150. As I read the bill, under its provisions, for the next 3 years she might receive for every quarter 75 percent of \$150, if the whole \$150 were earned in one quarter, or approximately \$115 every quarter, or \$460 every year.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not understand those figures. Where does the Senator get the \$115?

Mr. TAFT. That is about 75 percent of \$150. Let us say she earns \$150 in one quarter, and that was all the work she did during the entire war, yet, as I read the bill, she would be entitled to 75 percent of that for each quarter during the whole period provided in the bill,

and would receive about \$460 a year for 3 years.

Mr. KILGORE. Provided she registers for employment and holds herself ready to take employment, at all times holding herself ready to accept a job.

Mr. TOBEY. If it is suitable.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; if it is suitable, and subject to a great many different conditions and since ex-servicemen will have priority, probably there will not be a job she will have to take. So, having done \$150 worth of work during the war, as I understand, she will receive about \$460 a year for 3 years.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the same system that applies under social security in every State in the Union.

Mr. TAFT. No social-security system I know of provides for payment for more than 26 weeks.

Mr. KILGORE. No. Such inequalities arise in every system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate has been in session since 11 o'clock this morning, and I wonder whether the Senator is ready to suspend at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to suspend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should be glad to yield to the Senator if I had the floor. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from the Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Dr. A. F. Hinrichs, in response to a question which I addressed to the Bureau of Labor Statistics over the telephone with respect to the labor force in the United States at the present time. I knew that there is a large excess of workmen, and I wanted to ascertain exactly what the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated this excess to be. I find that, according to the best judgment of the Bureau, the total excess labor force in the United States at the present time is 6,700,000; that is to say, there are 6,700,000 more persons employed than would normally be employed. This letter breaks down the excess labor force between men and women, boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 19, young men and women between the ages of 20 and 24, women between the ages of 35 and 64, and so forth. It is a very interesting letter, and I believe that Members of the Senate would be very glad to have the opportunity of examining it. Therefore, I ask that it, together with an attached table, may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
Washington, August 9, 1944.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In reply to your verbal request to Mr. Tolles, I am glad to confirm the estimates given to your office over the telephone on the subject of excess labor force.

Information released by the Bureau of the Census would lead us to expect that about 56,000,000 persons would be available for employment in the United States at this time. The actual number of persons at work, or available for work, in April 1944, exceeded this figure by about 6,700,000. Thus, we can say that the excess labor force, above normal, is 6,700,000. For this purpose, the labor force includes all persons in the armed forces.

About 3,700,000 of the additional workers, above normal, were men, and 3,000,000 were women. The important groups of workers added to the labor force, above normal expectation, are as follows:

Sex and age group	Number above normal, April 1944	Consisting primarily of persons who would be or are—
Total.....	6,700,000	Nonworkers.
Boys and girls, 14-19.....	2,800,000	School and college students.
Young men and women, 20-24.....	800,000	College students and service wives.
Women, 35-64.....	1,500,000	Married women with no young children.
Men, 25-54.....	700,000	Marginal workers; Retired.
Men, 55 and over.....	800,000	

For your further information, I am attaching a table which gives further detail on this subject. This table shows for each sex and age group the number of persons drawn into the labor market in excess of normal, the percentage of excess over normal, and the percentage of each group which we would normally expect to find in the labor force as well as the percentage which actually appeared in the labor force in April 1944.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you and hope that the Bureau of Labor Statistics can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

A. F. HINRICHS,
Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics.
Estimated excess of labor forces over normal and labor force participation, by age and sex, April 1944

(In thousands)

Age and sex	Excess of actual over normal		Percent of total group in labor force	
	Number	Percent	Normal	Actual, April 1944
Total, 14 years and over.....	6,700	11.9	53.1	59.5
Male, 14 years and over.....	3,700	8.8	79.3	86.4
14-19.....	1,690	68.7	34.4	57.9
14-15.....	380	211.1	7.6	24.0
16-17.....	710	110.9	26.6	56.3
18-19.....	600	36.6	67.3	91.5
20-24.....	510	9.5	88.5	97.2
25-34.....	500	1.9	95.7	97.8
35-44.....	210	2.7	95.0	97.2
45-54.....	280	3.7	91.7	95.2
55-64.....	360	7.8	83.3	89.9
65 and over.....	420	22.3	39.6	48.5
Female, 14 years and over.....	3,000	20.9	27.1	32.8
14-19.....	1,070	85.6	17.9	33.2
14-15.....	160	320.0	2.0	9.3
16-17.....	480	218.2	9.5	30.0
18-19.....	430	43.9	40.7	58.6
20-24.....	420	14.7	46.9	53.8
25-34.....	10	2	36.0	36.1
35-44.....	630	21.2	30.6	37.2
45-54.....	500	29.0	24.0	31.0
55-64.....	280	28.3	17.3	22.0
65 and over.....	30	10.3	5.9	6.3

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope that we may obtain a vote on this measure tomorrow, and

to that end I am going to move a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. I hope that, when the Senate reassemble tomorrow, we may be able to agree on a limitation of debate on the bill and all amendments thereto. I will not make such a request at this time because of the absence of a number of Members of the Senate, but I hope that Senators will have that in view, when we reassemble tomorrow.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, August 11, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend, we know that Thy fatherly heart always opens with love in response to all our needs. We are coming unto Thee, compelled not only by our necessities but constrained by that great love, and encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy holy word.

We pray that the blessings of wisdom and understanding may rest upon these Thy servants whom Thou hast called to positions of leadership in the life of our Republic during these difficult and perilous days.

Grant that Thy presence and power may be given unto all who are now sacrificing their very lives for the principles of freedom and peace. May our beloved country ever be kept in the vanguard of those who are seeking to establish the kingdom of righteousness upon earth.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 7, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

- Department of Agriculture.
- Department of Justice.
- Department of the Navy.
- Department of War.
- Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
- Federal Security Agency.
- Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
- Selective Service System.

THE LATE BENJAMIN JARRETT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former colleague, Benjamin Jarrett, born July 18, 1881, in Sharon, Pa., died July 20, 1944, in Zanesville, Ohio. His death was preceded by a long illness and a stroke which occurred about 1 week prior thereto.

Mr. Jarrett served in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses and was not a candidate for reelection to the Seventy-eighth Congress. While a Member of the House, he served on the committees of Flood Control, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Ways and Means. His district was the then Twentieth District of Pennsylvania.

Prior to entering Congress, Mr. Jarrett had served as a member of the Pennsylvania State Senate from 1911 to 1913, and as a member of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Pennsylvania from 1919 to 1923.

Our former colleague chose the profession of the law as the course in which he could best serve, and at various periods he had served as solicitor for the boroughs of Farrell, Wheatland, and West Middlesex, and had also served as burgess of Wheatland for one term.

Born of humble Welsh parentage he early resolved to educate himself, and after several years in the Wheatland schools he became a telegraph operator for the Pennsylvania Railroad. Later he was employed by the Carnegie Steel Co. as a labor foreman. It was during this period that he decided to study law and began its study in his home at night. He was admitted to the bar in 1907 and immediately began the practice of his profession in Farrell. For 33 years he was a member of the firm of Armstrong & Jarrett. Mr. Jarrett was an able, conscientious lawyer. It was my privilege to try cases on the opposite side of the table from him and I can vouch for his honesty, integrity, and legal skill.

He leaves to survive him, his widow, Mrs. Agnes B. Jarrett; a son, Attorney Fred J. Jarrett; a daughter, Mrs. Dorothy Bentz; and two sisters, Miss Mary Jarrett and Mrs. Elizabeth J. Broad.

He was buried Sunday, July 23, in Oakwood Cemetery, Sharon, Pa.

An editorial appearing in the Sharon Herald of Friday, July 21, 1944, epitomizes his life and the feeling of his friends toward him. This editorial is as follows:

ATTORNEY BENJAMIN JARRETT

His hundreds of friends in the Shenango Valley and throughout western Pennsylvania, as well as many others who served with him in the State and National Capitols, mourn the death of Attorney Benjamin Jarrett, former Congressman and one of this district's most distinguished citizens.

From the time of his boyhood in the neighboring borough of Wheatland, which elected him burgess, to the close of his 6 years' service in Congress, Ben Jarrett was admired and respected for his ability and enterprise

in the several fields of endeavor in which he served. He was a good railroad telegrapher and steel mill labor foreman before he became an attorney, but it was as a young lawyer in Farrell that he first won wide fame and the confidence of fellow citizens who later sent him to represent them in the legislative halls at Harrisburg and Washington. And while he was serving as State senator, Congressman, member of the State workmen's compensation board, and in various other positions to which he was elected or appointed, Ben was always outstandingly loyal to the folks at home. Their interests were his first concern and nothing they requested was ever too trivial to merit his attention. Yet he mixed statesmanship with friendship, with the result that his record as a public servant surpassed the records of many of his more wordy contemporaries.

And somehow we also like to remember Attorney Jarrett for other things—his loyalty to the Republican Party, his ability as an orator, his frequent professional aid to persons who could not afford to hire a lawyer, and numerous other acts of generosity, his words of encouragement to younger people, his love of the outdoors, and his devotion to his family.

Those among us who knew Ben Jarrett best will miss him most.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I cite this little poem:

In the little fields where the gallant sleep,
And a rendezvous with the springtime keep,
There is no sorrow, or want, or fret,
Worries or care and no regret,
For it is pleasant to live in a house of sod,
And sing with the angels and talk with God.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio speech delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, over N. B. C. on June 20, 1944, entitled "A Year of Decision."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a poem by James Patrick McGovern.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in reference to certain suggestions as to military procedure after the shooting is over, and I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial and statement by the editor of the Evening Standard of Uniontown, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Houston Post of June 12, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts and communications, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an analysis on the subject of money, taken from the Southern Economic Journal. I have an estimate on this from the Public Printer, and I am advised that it will cost \$312. I ask unanimous consent that this extension may be permitted notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered before a special session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on the subject Flood Control and Valley Authorities in New Orleans, La., on Thursday, July 27, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post of August 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE EXPENDITURES

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Executive Expenditures may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on certain pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper release from one of the armed services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in this morning's New York Times entitled "An Appeal to Governor Dewey on the Soldier Vote."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each a statement from the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a dedicatory address delivered by Dr. Robert Yost at the unveiling of the honor-roll plaque at Bristol, Va.-Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by him in the city of Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a soldier in France to his father.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FISH and Mr. HOPE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness, and at the same time a deep sense of honor in my heart, that I announce to the House the death of a former member of this body, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty. Mr. McGroarty served in the House for two terms in the Seventy-fourth and the Seventy-fifth Congresses, from what was then the Eleventh District of California. He lived in that district for many, many years. Mr. McGroarty has been known as the poet laureate of our State and justly so.

No man has caught the spirit of California from the beginning of the coming of the Spanish padres down to the present time and gathered it together into one continuous golden thread such as this great man has done. His sense for the religious basis of the original settlement of our State not only illumined his writings about that portion of her history, but ran down through his appreciation of modern day California.

In my own district there was located the Mission Playhouse, a child of the work of John Steven McGroarty. It was a large theater where the John Steven McGroarty Mission Play used to be given. In that play was depicted the story of the founding of the California Missions. The players were not professional actors, but were citizens of San Gabriel, Calif., to whom the acting in that play was one of the greatest experiences of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, not only the Members of this House but every citizen of the State of California mourns sincerely the loss of this great and beautiful character.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The purpose of my rising, Mr. Speaker, is to inquire of the acting majority leader what the program will be for next week, since both the minority and the majority leaders have notified the Members to be here by next Tuesday, the 15th.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has been asked to meet on Monday to consider a resolution providing for debate and the consideration of a bill dealing with the disposition of surplus property. That bill, according to the best information we have, will be reported before the end of the week and will be ready for consideration on Tuesday. As acting majority leader—and I know the Speaker feels the same way—I think that every Member of the House should be here on Tuesday.

Of course, how long that bill will take, nobody can tell. As soon as possible the bill which is now pending in the Senate will also be considered in the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Did the gentleman say there would be a meeting of the Rules Committee on Monday?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The chairman has been asked to call a meeting on Monday?

Mr. FISH. And that is to report a rule on the surplus-property bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. FISH. I do not think there will be any difficulty in getting a rule, but I believe it will take 2 or 3 days to get the bill through, and I think the House should be so advised.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That may be true, but I think all the Members should be here on Tuesday.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It is generally considered that the legislation for next Tuesday will not be concluded in 1 day. The gentleman has also indicated that the Senate would have something ready for us at that time. Just what is the bill that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. RAMSPECK. As soon as the bill that is now under consideration in the Senate comes over here, it will be considered in the House as fast as it can be reported by the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Several gentlemen from Ohio are very much interested in what will come on in the latter part of next week. If the gentleman has reference to the George bill and the Murray-Kilgore bill, they will have to go to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They will have to go to the committee, of course. I do not know when they will be reported. I was simply trying to convey to the Members that it is the purpose to have that bill considered as soon as we reasonably can.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know, of course, what will develop, but my guess would be that it will not be ready for consideration on the floor of the House next week. I am just guessing. There is another bill pending in the Senate and I wonder if it is going to be the purpose of the leadership to press that bill at the end of the week. My reason to try to get better information is that there are several Members from Ohio and the neighboring States who have engagements at the end of next week, and they will be right up against it. If the gentleman is certain that these bills will come up, they will cancel those engagements, and if not, they want to fill them.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think anybody can give them any assurance at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that after the Members convene here on next Monday it is presumed that we will be in regular session every day?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That would be my presumption, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa. The only agreement I have and the only agreement I am authorized to make is to give the Members 3 days' notice before we take up this surplus-property bill. Any further agreement about the program will have to be made later.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it contemplated that there will be anything but general debate on Tuesday?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That I cannot say to the gentleman from New York. I think the Members ought to be here Tuesday. The rule has not been granted, and, of course, I cannot tell how much general debate there will be.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Certainly the Committee on Rules will give very generous time for debate on a bill of that importance. It will certainly take up all of Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair interpolate just a moment?

The Members have been asked to be back here on Tuesday. The Chair hopes that nothing will take place on the floor of the House today that will not invite them to come back on Tuesday.

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Post-war Planning may have until Saturday night to file an interim report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein an interesting editorial under date of August 7, 1944, appearing in the Boston Globe entitled "Jackson Hole."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, August 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1751. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the ninth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended March 31, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 667); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1752. A letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, transmitting the report of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, pursuant to the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1944, Public Law No. 90, Seventy-eighth Congress (H. Doc. No. 668); to the

Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1753. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of May 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1754. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1755. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, 1943; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1756. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1757. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period June 1, 1944, to July 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1758. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damages for personal injury or death or for damage to or loss or destruction of property caused by service personnel or civilian employees or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Claims.

1759. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1760. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a revised quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1761. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the Coast Guard Reserve and in the Marine Corps Reserve, during the period June 1, 1944, to July 31, 1944, who have not had prior commissioned military service, and in the United States Naval Reserve for the period May 30, 1944, to July 28, 1944, inclusive; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1762. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1763. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 61 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Special Committee on Post-War Planning. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 408. Resolution to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5169. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 5170. A bill to extend the benefits of title 11 of the Social Security Act to certain employees performing service outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5171. A bill to eliminate unfairness and discrimination against enlisted personnel of the Medical Department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5172. A bill to eliminate unfairness and discrimination against enlisted personnel of the Hospital Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 5173. A bill to provide additional compensation for enlisted personnel of the Medical Department of the Army who serve in combat areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5174. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research and Development in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Council of the City of Toledo, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 4915, post-war highway bill now pending before the House of Representatives, and declaring an emergency; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5175. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5176. A bill for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5177. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5178. A bill to authorize the President to present the Distinguished Service Medal to Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5980. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petitions circulated by W. S. LeSeur of New

Rochelle and Mrs. Charles Staiger of Scarsdale, N. Y., and signed by sundry other residents in Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5981. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the congregation of St. John's United Evangelical Protestant Church of New Sewickley Township, Beaver County, Pa., representing approximately 200 persons, for passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or distribution of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5982. By the SPEAKER: Supplemental petition of James J. Laughlin, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the impeachment of the Honorable Edward C. Eicher, chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5983. Also, petition of district 51 of Lions International, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to the Department of State that the government of the island be given an opportunity to express its views before such treaties between the United States and other countries, specially in the Caribbean area, are definitely signed and put into effect; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5984. Also, petition of National Cotton Council of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to post-war cotton exports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 8, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. A. P. Wilson, minister of the First Christian Church, Charlotte, N. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come humbly before Thee this day. For long months we have been groping our way in the darkness and horror of the Valley of the Shadow of Death. There have been times when we have lost hold of Thy hand and lost our confidence in Thee.

Yet we thank Thee for Thy leading and guidance.

And now we see before us the glimmerings of the new day, a day when peace shall be our aim and heart's desire.

Grant that, as Thou hast guided us in the difficult days of war, we will not shun Thy guidance in the more difficult days that lie ahead, days of perplexity, days of problem, days that ask for patience and superlative wisdom.

We pray Thee that when the time does come no hatred or viciousness shall interfere, but that we will readily exchange the closed fist for the open hand.

Grant Thy benediction upon this honorable House. Be with their loved ones on the battle front, and help them in the problems of their personal lives.

Grant to them the wisdom which is from above which is "first peaceable," and grant them Thy wisdom and understanding so that when the history of the world is written mankind may look back

to bless them for their decision in this fateful hour.

In the name of Him who came to establish the Kingdom of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, August 10, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on June 30, 1944, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of L. E. Berno, of Mansfield, Ohio, praying redress for alleged infringement of certain copyrights relating to the principles of unemployment compensation, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL PICNIC ON MASONIC ISLAND, CANADA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by 500 Canadian and American citizens meeting in joint session at the annual international picnic on Masonic Island, Lake Metigoshe, Canada, which is on the boundary line, in the Peace Garden. The resolution was sent to me by Judge Gumunder Grimson, of Rugby, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas this annual international picnic on Masonic Island, Lake Metigoshe, has had from the very beginning, the promotion of peace and good will between the citizens of the Province of Manitoba, Dominion of Canada, and those of North Dakota, United States of America; and

Whereas the citizens of these two great nations are, with our allies, now engaged in the most gigantic struggle the world has ever known, to preserve the right of men to be free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we here recognize the magnificent response which our two nations have made to the call for a mighty army, the world's greatest navy, and air fleet of unequaled magnitude. Not only this, but we have furnished to our allies war machines and material in ever-increasing abundance.

Further, again we pledge our all—our lives—our fortunes and our sacred honor. Many of our sons have made the supreme sacrifice. Thousands more of our best youth must make the same sacrifice. Few of us, however, will go forth to battle, but we cannot avoid our great responsibility as loyal citizens of our respective nations, to see that never again shall Nazi Germany or the military caste in Japan have power to disturb the peace of the world, that we shall never again be unprepared to defend ourselves and that some form of effective cooperative international organization is formed, by means